L500
E3h
1958
No.5

~~TRIPLICATE~~

Hearing of the

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE 12TH GRADE

CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

---oOo---

CALIFORNIA
JUL 13 1962

Held in

Mark Thomas Inn

Monterey, California

---oOo---

Monday, December 15, 1958

10:00 O'Clock, A.M.

---oOo---

DO NOT REMOVE FROM ROOM
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
SERVICE

ALICE BOOK
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
2844 VERNA WAY, SACRAMENTO 21, CALIFORNIA

Hearing of the

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND THE 12TH GRADE

CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

---oOo---

Held in

Mark Thomas Inn

Monterey, ~~California~~

---oOo---

Monday, December 15, 1958

10:00 O'Clock, A.M.

---oOo---

ALICE BOOK
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
2844 VERNA WAY, SACRAMENTO 21, CALIFORNIA

APPEARANCES

---oOo---

Assemblyman Harold T. Sedgwick, Chairman

Assemblyman Carl A. Britschgi

Assemblyman Sheridan N. Hegland

Assemblyman Lou Cusanovich

Assemblyman Don Anderson

Assemblyman Carlos Bee

Assemblyman Richard T. Hanna

Assemblyman George G. Crawford

Assemblyman Alan Pattee

James Marshall, Consultant

Blanche Hansen, Secretary

---oOo---

INDEX

Speaker	Page No.
CHAIRMAN HAROLD T. SEDGWICK	4
ASSEMBLYMAN GLEN COOLIDGE	7
GLADYS STONE	9
WILLIAM CAGNEY	14
NORMAN S. LIEN	19
DR. FRED CHING	25
GORDON SINCLAIR	38
JIM CORLEY	43
DR. ENGELBERT	43
FREDERICK HUBER	65
DR. JOE WEST	87
DR. ARTHUR D. BROWNE	100
ALICE WILDER	112
DR. GARY BROWN	121
ED HILL	126
HOWARD WIKE	130

Monday, December 15, 1958, 10:00 o'clock, A.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Will the meeting please come to order. We are a little late here in getting started and we have quite an agenda today. This Subcommittee is very pleased for the opportunity of coming to Monterey for this meeting today. The meeting is called for the purpose of receiving information concerning the need of establishing a state college in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties.

This Subcommittee on Higher Education beyond the 12th Grade is part of the Assembly Interim Committee on Education. I am Assemblyman Harold T. Sedgwick, Chairman. At this time I would like to introduce the rest of our Committee. On my extreme left is Assemblyman Glen Coolidge from Santa Cruz, Assemblyman Crawford from San Diego County; Assemblyman Hanna from Westminster, and on my right here is Carlos Bee from Hayward, Don Anderson from Monterey Park, Lou Cusanovich from Van Nuys, Assemblyman Hegland from La Mesa, and Assemblyman Britschgi from San Mateo County. On my right here is Miss Blanche Hansen, our very able Secretary, and on my extreme left is Jim Marshall, our Consultant to the Committee, and we have our Reporter here today, Miss Book.

We are meeting here under the authority of House Resolution No. 202. I would like to read this Resolution to you in order to acquaint everyone with its content.

"Relative to a study of the need for additional centers

of higher education.

"Whereas the liaison committee of the State Board of Education and the regents of the University of California have published a report entitled 'The Need for Additional Centers of Public Education in California', dated December 17, 1956; and

"Whereas, because of the rapid population increase in the counties of San Mateo, Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, it is essential that a comprehensive study be made of the need for additional centers of public higher education in these counties; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, as follows:

"1. That the liaison committee of the State Board of Education and the regents of the University of California are hereby directed to restudy the subject matter of their report as it affects said counties and to report further thereon to the 1959 regular Session of the Legislature.

"2. That the Department of Education of the State of California is directed to ascertain, study, and analyze all facts relating to the need for additional centers of public higher education in the counties of San Mateo, Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, and to report thereon to the Assembly on or before the 10th day of the 1959 Session of the Legislature.

"3. That the Assembly Interim Committee on Education, in addition to the other studies required to be made by it, is hereby directed to ascertain, study and analyze all facts

relating to the need for additional centers of public higher education in the Counties of San Mateo, Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, and to report thereon to the Assembly on or before the 10th day of the 1959 regular Session of the Legislature, including in its report its recommendations for appropriate legislation.

"4. That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to send copies of this Resolution to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and to the Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of California."

As you can see from this Resolution, there are three groups who are presently studying the need for a state college here in this three-county area. In the past couple of months this Subcommittee has also held hearings in San Mateo County and in San Bernardino County as provided by HR 304.

Today we have representatives with us from Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties who will present to the Committtee information they have gathered relative to the need for a state college. Our thanks goes to Assemblymen Glen Coolidge and Alan Pattee, the very able Assemblymen from this area, who have done an outstanding job in making the arrangements here today for this meeting.

With us also are representatives from the State Department of Education and the University of California, who we hope will give some of their views on this subject.

In 1957 the State Department of Education in cooperation

with the liaison committee of the California State Board of Education and the regents of the University of California published a book entitled "A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California".

In this report the Monterey-Santa Cruz area was rated number 6 on the priority list of possible new state colleges. Since that time three new state colleges have been authorized by the Legislature, the ones in Alameda County, Orange County, and the Sonoma-Marin areas. As a matter of local interest, Alameda County was number 1 on the priority list, Sonoma-Marin was number 7, and Orange County was not included on the list at all. Perhaps the representatives from the State Department of Education will bring us up to date today on the priority list and we can learn which place Monterey-Santa Cruz holds today. Now, at this time I think that gives you a little brief outline of the purpose of this hearing today and in order to start today's hearing off, I want to introduce to you your own Assemblyman from Santa Cruz area, Assemblyman Glen Coolidge, who has a few words he would like to say, and Mr. Coolidge has to leave early so I want to recognize him first. Assemblyman Coolidge.

ASSEMBLYMAN COOLIDGE: Thank you very much. Chairman Sedgwick and my Distinguished Colleagues in the Legislature, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very pleased to be here this morning. I am sorry I do have to leave. I am starting my vacation, the first one in four years, and I have put it off

one day in order to come over and be here this morning with you. I am very happy that we have such a fine turnout here to try to justify to this Committee the need for the establishment of a state college in our area. I believe that this was quite well indicated some time ago, as you indicated, Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Higher Education, rather, established the fact that we did need a state college in our area and at the last regular Session of the Legislature we were discussing the priorities and appropriating money for the establishment of state colleges, and as they got down to the Monterey Bay area the well went dry and that ended the applications at that time, so this is a reiteration of that request and I am sure that we have people here who are most capable in making the presentation.

I should like very much also to pay respect to my colleague, Assemblyman Pattee, for the fine job that he has done in getting the group together and making the arrangements and his action on legislation in Sacramento that tends toward assisting in the establishment of a state college here.

I think that I will mention that I am particularly pleased to see Mr. Corley here this morning. He is Vice-President of the University of California, and as you people are talking this morning, I wish you would do so with a prayer on your lip and a hope in your heart that the University of California will establish a campus of that wonderful institution in our area.

You all know that is under consideration and we are all hopeful it will be here. So as you are speaking this morning,

why, understand that there is a listening ear here and we are delighted to have Mr. Corley with us.

With that, Mr. Chairman and my Colleagues, I apologize now for not being able to stay, but I am going to run along. Now, in the presentation of witnesses I have asked Mr. Carl Conelly who is a man who has long been interested in educational programs in our area of Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, and also Mr. Sinclair, the editor of our paper in Santa Cruz, and I know that you along with your editors and others and with our County Superintendent, Mr. Lien, will be prepared to join with all of you in trying to impress this Committee.

I am sorry I can't be with you for lunch but it is nice seeing you all again. With that, I bid you adieu.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Glen. Now, our first witness here on the list this morning is Miss Gladys Stone, Superintendent of the Monterey County Schools. Will Miss Stone please come forward?

MISS STONE: I am sorry I didn't bring more copies. I didn't realize there would be so many members. Do you wish me to go into detail in the report or just briefly outline it?

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, whichever you would like to do, Miss Stone.

MISS STONE: Well, I think I will just bring out some of the highlights that I have here incorporated in the report and we are referring to your study for the need for

additional centers of public education in California and we are basing our report on four areas:

1. Geographical isolation from any institution of higher learning.

2. Lack of any four-year institution, public or private, offering upper class college work or teacher training.

3. Projected growth in population and school enrollments.

4. Cultural background of Monterey County.

In our first item we have detailed to you the isolation of Monterey County and some of the problems that we have in trying to upgrade our educational system in the county and obtain help from institutions. Number 2 is the same.

Number 3 is the projected growth in population and school enrollments. I would like to take some time on this. We have projected the enrollment on the scale which we have shown in the back, trying to compare the projected enrollment with the projected enrollment which was in this report that you have for 1956-57, when if we use the current live birth rates less 20 percent for drop-outs, which is the normal drop-out, we reach about the same figure that you have for 1980.

However, if we take the last five years of growth in high schools and project them, we come up with a figure of about 6,000 seniors or enrollment in the high school, so we are about 1200 to 1500 higher on actual enrollment in a projected growth until 1980 than would show by your report.

Our large growth has been in the last five years. So

we also took the last 10 years and projected it and we are below the projected growth for about an average of what you show in your report. But the great growth has been in the last five years as you note by the chart. We have also included the enrollment in the secondary schools as of October 31 and you will note that the freshman or ninth grade is almost double what the twelfth grade is for projected growth. The thirteenth grade in junior college is more than double.

We have also shown on the last page the mileages from the high schools to any institutions of higher learning within our area, trying to support our isolation.

I think that that will cover it unless you have some questions.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you, Miss Stone. Are there questions from the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Could you give us the number of junior colleges that there are presently serving this same area?

MISS STONE: We have--do you want to go outside of our county, too? We have one junior college district in the county, Hartnell, and then we have the Monterey Peninsula Junior College which is part of the Monterey High School District, and then we have a junior college at Hollister that is outside of our county.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Those two junior colleges serve these high schools that you have listed on the last page?

MISS STONE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: For the most part.

MISS STONE: And at the present time they are also serving Santa Cruz County.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: Under the three counties under consideration, Monterey County has the bulk of the population of high school students?

MISS STONE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: Santa Cruz--does it have a junior college?

MISS STONE: Not as yet. They voted a district. We are servicing them.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Miss Stone, where do most of your high school graduates go that go to junior colleges? Where do they attend now?

MISS STONE: Well, most of them attend Hartnell in Monterey. The Monterey Peninsula College is part of the Monterey High School District and they keep--Carmel, Pacific Grove and Hartnell extend to the southern end of our county, taking in three high school districts.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEDWICK: Well, would you know offhand where most of the students attend when they go to the state colleges?

MISS STONE: Yes, I think that shows in our report here. If you will turn to item 1, top of page 2, this

was in 1955, there were six of our high schools and there were 98 eligible to attend the University of California but only 27 of this number attended. There were 357 eligible to attend state colleges but only 19 of this number attended. There were 455 eligible to attend state-supported institutions but only 46 graduates attended such institutions. This means that only 10 percent of the students eligible to attend state-supported institutions did so.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions from any members of the Committee? Mr. Crawford.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Do you have any compilation or any figures concerning the projected enrollment in, say, Santa Cruz or San Benito?

MISS STONE: No, I didn't go into that.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Do you know whether there is a heavier projected enrollment in Monterey than in the other two counties?

MISS STONE: I believe so, but I am not certain about that. The County Superintendents are here from the other two counties and they can answer your question.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no other questions, thank you very much, Miss Stone. At this time I would like to introduce Assemblyman Pattee--I guess he just left. Our next witness this morning is Mr. William Cagney,

Superintendent of San Benito County Schools. Mr. Cagney, please.

MR. CAGNEY: As you probably know, San Benito County is the smallest of the three counties. We have a population of approximately 15,000 people. We have a total school population as of October 31 of this year of 3,298 enrolled.

The percentage of growth in school population for the last 10 years has been approximately 20 percent. It is our opinion that our growth will be steady, but because of the location and because of the nature of the county, we think that it is going to be growth largely from residents rather than industries.

We anticipate a greater increase, but not anything spectacular, of course. Our county, as I say, is small and perhaps on the basis of number of people, this isn't as important, but from the needs educationally the establishment of a four-year college is very great. We have a great problem in getting services for our teachers. We have a number of teachers who are not fully trained and who require additional training to receive their regular certification and because of the crowded schedule of San Jose State College and with San Francisco State College, we are able to get very little for our teachers in the way of in-service training.

We have tried over a number of years to be able to schedule extension courses in our areas and we are very fortunate if we can get one or two each year and this doesn't meet our needs in any way.

Another one of our great problems is in getting prepared teachers. We have a percentage, maybe too large a percentage of our teachers who are not fully qualified, people who have approximately two years of college who are working in our schools and we would prefer to have all of our people start with full training and we feel that if we had a four-year college, a teacher-training institution in our own area, our chances for recruiting people to work in our schools would be much better. We would have a closer liaison and there would be more people who would understand and know our area and we would have a better opportunity to better staff our schools.

Now, is there anything else that you would like? I think that we have a real need in staffing our schools with well qualified people and we have not been able to get services from the other teacher-training institutions. San Jose State people are very agreeable and very friendly, but they repeatedly tell us that their demands in their own area are too great. They can't send their staff members out to us because there is too much that they have to do close at hand and their staff people would rather work within a few miles of their own schools rather than to travel 40 or 50 miles to work with a small group of teachers for two or three hours a couple of times a week.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions? Assemblyman Bee.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: What is the total enrollment at Hollister Junior College?

MR. CAGNEY: At the junior college, approximately 100 at the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: Is that in combination with the high school?

MR. CAGNEY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: What is your total high school population?

MR. CAGNEY: At the present, 771 enrolled as of October 31.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: That would be from nine through twelve?

MR. CAGNEY: Right. And the ninth grade, incidentally is about 40 percent larger than the twelfth grade and I have figures of enrollment that go down into the first grade, and we are going to have a steady increase of figures showing that the increase comes to about 33 percent through the eight years.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: What percentage of your high school graduates go on to college and of the junior college graduates that continue on, and where do they generally go?

MR. CAGNEY: Dr. Browne, Superintendent of the high school and junior college, is here and I discussed this with him Friday, and as all of our elementary school feeds into one high school and junior college, and we only have one, I thought Dr. Browne should be the person you should talk to about that. He has some statistics, I know.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Could you tell us what percentage of your teachers are provisional teachers?

MR. CAGNEY: About 35 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: About 35 percent. Is there any off-campus teacher training centers in any of the three counties that we are talking about here this morning?

MR. CAGNEY: Both San Jose and San Francisco offer courses in the area, in we will say, the closest, Watsonville, Gilroy, Salinas, Monterey. There are courses offered by San Jose State and San Francisco in the area, but they don't care to come into our area because of the fact that we can't guarantee them large enough enrollments in any class.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Can you give us an idea of how far away these teacher training centers are from here?

MR. CAGNEY: Well, Gilroy is 18 miles, Salinas is 24 miles.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Within the area of around an average of 20 miles from the area?

MR. CAGNEY: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: All right. Thank you very kindly.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Do you have an estimate of your projected enrollment, say in 1965?

MR. CAGNEY: 1965--it would be approximately 325.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Now, with regard to

your inability to get qualified teachers, are your salaries comparable with other areas where they have qualified teachers?

MR. CAGNEY: In some districts they are and in some districts they are not. They vary a great deal. We will say we have two school districts where the salaries I think are comparable, pretty much follow the state pattern. In the smaller schools, the rural schools, the salaries are perhaps smaller.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Don't you think that the lower salaries might in some respect be the reason for your having provisional teachers rather than certificated ones?

MR. CAGNEY: That is partly so, yes. It is not solely so because each year when we have vacancies we register them with all of the teacher placement agencies and we work very closely with them and we find that there just aren't enough teachers who want to come into the area and very often we end up with provisionally qualified teachers because there are no other applicants. We do sometimes get people who are certificated who state that they might work if conditions were right, but I think that it isn't solely just a matter of salaries. I think there are other things that contribute.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Teachers are human and they like nice salaries and naturally they are going to go where they get the better salaries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, thank you very much. Now, our next witness is Norman S.

Lien, Superintendent of the Santa Cruz County Schools. While he is coming up, I would like at this time to introduce Assemblyman Pattee. I tried to introduce you a while ago but you had left.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: I am sorry I was late, but I have been rather busy this morning.

MR. LIEN: Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to apologize for not having prepared something for your record. However, before the day is over, I am sure the high schools in our own county have something prepared and perhaps I can gather it together and leave it with the Committee. In Santa Cruz County we have three high schools. Two of them we consider fairly large, approximately 1700 in each, and San Lorenzo Valley School District with about 60 seniors, 200 to 300 students in the high school.

In preparing for this particular meeting I tried to imagine what you would want in the way of testimony, and it just seemed to me that you would probably want to substantiate or possibly enhance some of the figures and statements in this particular publication here, and so looking at our number 1, our student population in the county--as far as I have statistics, which go back to 1954, our county has grown in student population at the rate of five percent a year consistently. This is not phenomenal, but it is steady. Our student population at this particular time, October 31, showed 15,435 students in our schools, K through 12.

Of this number 747 are now high school seniors. From the reports from both Santa Cruz High School and Watsonville High School, the two larger schools, on the number of students who go on to institutions of higher education, the percentage mentioned in this report is substantiated.

As a matter of fact, in Santa Cruz High School District, 46 percent go on, and in the Watsonville High School District, 55 percent go on. I do not have the percentage of San Lorenzo Valley. So that the evidence supports and enhances the report of the need for additional centers.

I have projected for 10 years beginning 1957--I have projected the high school enrollment up to 1966, and where we had 692 seniors in Santa Cruz County in 1957, in 1966 we anticipate 1100. This is consistent with the over-all growth of the county.

Of the 46 percent who go on to institutions of higher learning, 34 percent take the Carnegie Units, the seven or eight Carnegie Units in preparation for state colleges and Universities. The balance that go on to higher institutions are largely taken up by the junior colleges.

Miss Stone mentioned that we have just organized a junior college district and approved it, and this, of course, will have some impact on the possible enrollment in four-year institutions, although as all of us in the business know, each has a proper niche and communities exist with both junior colleges and state colleges.

I subscribe and support the statements of Mr. Cagney, that we feel the absence of a four-year institution here because of the difficulties that we get involved in in upgrading our teachers and also in avilability of teachers.

I believe that is about--I would like to mention this, that our Chamber of Commerce says that in Santa Cruz County for the first time the percentage increase of population has passed the state percentage of increase. In other words, we are growing more rapidly than the rest of the state is growing.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Crawford.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Taking your figures for 1966 and putting them with the projected figures of Monterey, possibly 2000, and San Benito of 325, that is figuring for 1965, I have a total twelfth grade enrollment of approximately 3,425 and using your figure of about 66 percent of those who go on to higher learning--

MR. LIEN: 46 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: That is even smaller than that. Say 50 percent, that would be less than 1700, and certainly not all of those would be going to a state college, but I imagine there are a certain percentage going to different schools out of the area, perhaps where their parents came from. Do you really feel that the population potential for a state college or a four-year institution is sufficient here to support the capital outlay?

MR. LIEN: You are talking about 1700. Remember

that is only one grade you are talking about. There are four levels of population in a state college so that you would have to multiply this by somewhat less than 1700 to get the total which, if you just use 1700 you would be talking about 6800.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: What do you estimate your total population to enter into a four-year institution of learning in this area would be?

MR. LIEN: What would I estimate?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR. LIEN: Well, I don't know because I am only familiar with my own county. I can't answer that. But I am very pleased to hear that it might be 6800. I think you ought to be, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Well, we have a small college in San Diego and we have had an enrollment of 10,000.

MR. LIEN: Yes. Would you consider that small?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: No, too big.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I just wondered if in forming your junior college district, have you gone so far as to select an administrative staff for your junior college, your proposed junior college, yet?

MR. LIEN: No, we are right in the middle of everything. On January 27 we are holding an election for the selection of the governing board and, of course, subsequent to their election all of these problems of administration and staff and program and all that sort of thing will be their

responsibility.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: The reason I ask you that is because it's been my experience that a junior college administrator has a more chary viewpoint about the impact of a state college upon their possible enrollment than perhaps you might have. I was interested in your statement that junior colleges and state colleges both have a proper niche. I agree, but I don't find too much agreement as to where the niche is or how far it extends and I think you will find with the formation of a junior college that the attitude of the administrators possibly should be taken into consideration as to the propriety of starting a state college in your particular area or trying to entice, as Mr. Coolidge said, the University-type operation. I think you might keep that in mind, discussing it with them as to how you might come to us with your proposal.

MR. LIEN: Well, I guess I happen to have been associated with junior college people who were also enthusiastic about state colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: You mentioned 46 percent of one high school continue on and 55 percent of another. Right at the present time where are these students attending?

MR. LIEN: I know precisely where they are as far as junior colleges are concerned. I know that they are in 18 different junior colleges in 16 different counties because we are paying the bill for this thing. The other people who go to institutions such as state colleges and universities, most

of them go to San Jose and a somewhat lesser number go to the University at Berkeley. Then, I am sure that there are representatives of Santa Cruz County in minor numbers in almost every educational institution in this state and out of state, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: If you had a four-year institution nearby in the area, do you think these percentages would likely increase?

MR. LIEN: Yes. I think it would be a natural thing to expect that.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: How many provisional teachers do you have in Santa Cruz County, approximately?

MR. LIEN: We are reducing them, by the way, but we have, I think 60 to 70 out of a permanent staff of over 500.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: Then your percentage isn't as high as San Benito?

MR. LIEN: No, I don't say that we are at the ultimate in salaries, but we probably pay better salaries over there and we have, I am sure, generally a better school organization. There are not so many one-teacher districts as you would expect in a smaller county.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, thank you very much for your testimony.

MISS STONE: May I add some information?

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: You may. Come forward, please.

MISS STONE: You asked me about the growth of our county. We have a 7.6 growth from last year until this year, and we had a 20 percent growth in the junior college area. The figures which I gave you in the report do not cover all students attending institutions of higher learning. I did not include the private institutions such as Stanford and some of the other private colleges, so that I only included state-supported colleges, so our growth is projected to be larger than it has been, so we will have in the next five years over 100 percent growth in the projection that is given for us. Perhaps that would help.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you. At this time I would like to introduce Senator Farr from Carmel who has just joined us. Very glad to have you. Do you have any comment you would like to make, Senator?

SENATOR FARR: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, I believe our next witness will be Stuart Mitchell, Unified School District from Carmel. He apparently is not here. Is Dr. Fred Ching from Hartnell College here?

DR. CHING: Yes. If I may stand, I would appreciate it. I can speak better standing and possibly the audience could hear better also.

I would like to refer first and answer possibly the

question raised by a gentleman on the Committee with respect to the niche which the state college has in this program of higher education.

In the first place, the University of California accepts only--well, let us say about 11 percent of the graduates of our high schools in California are eligible to go into the University of California. And of that 11 percent, presumably, only 4 or 5 do enroll.

In other words, there is a very selective process so far as the University of California is concerned.

The state colleges are not as selective in their requirements. They are not as rigid as the University of California.

The junior colleges, on the other hand, have a two-fold responsibility which neither the University of California nor the state colleges have, and that is a responsibility for a high degree of academic training in the first two years, equivalent to that of the University of California or the state colleges.

That is the academic phase of it because they do have to prepare them to go on to the University with full academic standing, equivalent to that of the state colleges or the University, and incidentally, Dr. Sproul made in a recent address this statement, that for those students who came from the junior colleges in their third year to the University and who were otherwise qualified to have entered the University, the junior college did equally as good a job as the University of California in the first two years.

We do on the other hand have to admit anyone who is a graduate of a high school in our junior colleges, and under special conditions some who are not graduates and whom we feel are eligible and qualified and would benefit from education at junior colleges.

Now, that is probably a little bit aside from the point of what I should say, but I thought I would preface my remarks by calling attention to the fact the niche each one of them plays very briefly. I thought also of importance to be brought out in this meeting since most of the facts and figures have been given by the college superintendent, it might be well to point out the fact that the state colleges by law formed and by legislative action have four or five functions.

The first is teacher education. I want to refer to these functions in relationship to this particular area which is at a great distance from the state colleges.

The second, and I don't think that these are necessarily in order of importance, is preparation for University training, liberal education, in other words, responsibilities of citizenship which let us say, where a person has no particular vocation in mind but college education, broadened educational understanding, that type of thing, liberal education; and then vocational education. The state colleges are required to develop vocational educational opportunities, business and industries. I want to point out the fact to you gentlemen that state colleges, while they have all of these objectives in mind, they have specialized

in certain areas, probably by possible preference of the area, possibly feeding or meeting a community need.

San Jose State College, I believe, is specializing somewhat in engineering. Cal Poly is specializing in agriculture and engineering. Fresno State College has a large agricultural program, but their agricultural program is adapted to the local area such as the raisin crop industry and figs and that type of thing along with their animal husbandry.

San Francisco State College has undertaken, I think as a specialty, education of handicapped children, both mentally and physically.

I would like to point out to you the fact that we in this area, in this three-county area, wherein we are 60 miles from the nearest state college, 130 miles at least from--I am speaking from Salinas--80 miles from here to San Jose, 140 or 150 miles to Cal Poly, and San Francisco or Fresno, 150 or 160 miles from here, that we have an area that is not served, as set up by the State Legislature. The Legislature specifically established the state colleges as regional colleges and we in this area had to go 60 to 100 miles for a state college and are not being benefited and our young people are not getting the advantages of these four or five objectives of the state college without having to go a great distance. State colleges should and are regional colleges.

I would like to say in closing that San Jose State College was built for approximately 6,000 students and while

it may be a small college in the minds of some, it is now 12,000 and very overcrowded. The land is small in area and the buildings are having to go up and the area is particularly crowded. I would like to point out the fact that in Salinas during these past four or five years San Jose State College has maintained an on-campus summer school and we have been operating, at least been partially, let us say, operating with their assistance or they with our assistance this on-campus program of San Jose State at Hartnell College. That might give evidence of the fact that San Jose State feels that in their terrific program of concentration there should be a college in this particular area.

I firmly believe that we should be looking toward the future. I would like to point out the fact that San Jose--one time when the college was established was criticized as being far in the country. San Jose has since been industrialized, very highly industrialized, but that has been only within the last few years through the efforts of chambers of commerce and private citizens. I want to point out the fact that Monterey County Industrial Development, an organization of both public and private organizations is working very industriously and with a considerable accomplishment toward further industrialization of this area. We in Hartnell have about 1200 students. I believe that Monterey Peninsula College has about the same number. Both of us are looking toward the doubling of our campus buildings and facilities for a doubling of enrollments in the

not too distant future.

It is our belief, and I am sure that the University of California in thinking of locating in this area must likewise have been given some feeling or had some feeling of belief and sincerity that this area is an area of growth. We firmly believe so.

The evidence I think from our County Superintendent of Schools is that there is basic data relative to future growth. I would feel that the Committee in looking forward to a college of the state would not necessarily feel that it ought to be located in a spot where there is already the complete population, but to an area which in the future will develop as I so firmly and sincerely feel that this area will. I am prepared to answer any questions that the Committee wishes to ask me at this time except for the facts and figures that have been given to you by the County Superintendent. I would not want to duplicate those.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you, Mr. Ching. Any questions by the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: There are two questions. First, assuming there was consideration of the location of both, at this time, of both a state college and a branch of the University. Which would you feel would serve the needs of this particular area more properly?

DR. CHING: Well, I think the evidence is in the figures. However prejudiced I may be, the facts would be

that a state college would serve the area better simply because it is broader in its scope. It would take in more people so far as the education is concerned because of its lessened requirements. The University requirements are toward the upper and the graduate schools. The state colleges are broader in their requirements and the junior college is even broader. Does that answer the question?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: That answers my question. Assuming then the establishment of a state college in this area, would this not have an immediate impact upon the number of students that you would attract in your freshman year following the establishment of such a college?

DR. CHING: Yes, that bears on a previous question I believe you raised. I am an enthusiast about either a state college or University simply because I feel that each one has its niche, but the brining in of a state college likewise brings in population. The immediate impact, yes, would be to reduce the enrollment somewhat, not too much. The facts would bear that out, I believe, where state colleges have been located. But the ultimate impact would be to bring in more people. It is like a business or industry and it would aos tend to increase the enrollment of the junior colleges to bring in a state college or the University by the virtue of the fact that those institutions are here.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Dr. Ching, just what kind of courses did we have at Hartnell this summer in teachers'

courses?

DR. CHING: These were courses--I shouldn't have implied that they were our courses. We loaned the facilities or leased the facilities to San Jose State and one of our instructors was Acting Dean or at least assisting the administration of it. We have done this for the past several years. There were about 200, or have been about 200 enrolled each of the past four or five years that we have maintained this.

But that is a San Jose State on-campus program. In other words, it is complete operation by San Jose State and not a branch as such, but an on-campus operation for which the teachers are mainly benefited because courses offered were largely those which teachers would like to take during the summer.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Well, Hartnell's enrollment would be substantially affected by the development of the junior college program in Santa Cruz County, will it not?

DR. CHING: It will be. Let me put it this way. One out of five students now come from Santa Cruz County and I made a prediction and a chart of probably growth. It will affect us for presumably two years and then we will be back again to normal growth provided circumstances remain as they now are.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

SENATOR FARR: Dr. Ching, you feel that the state colleges could provide a valuable function in having

off-campus activities, teacher training activities in the junior colleges? For example, there are certain people here in the Monterey Peninsula and in Salinas who would like to take teacher courses in San Jose State, which is qualified to give this work, could have sort of a satellite activity at Hartnell and one at Monterey Peninsula College and other junior colleges around the state. Do you think that would be of value?

DR. CHING: Throughout the year, Senator?

SENATOR FARR: Yes.

DR. CHING: It would be helpful, yes. I don't know whether it is possible or not to arrange such or to have such arrangement. We found it extremely helpful in the summer time to have San Jose come down and give these courses and, incidentally, the participants of those enrolled came from all of Monterey County, Santa Cruz County and San Benito largely and as far south as San Luis Obispo. I don't know why, because they have facilities down that way, but our enrollees came from as far away as that. Our people are allowed usually in city school districts and I presume elsewhere in the county to take a certain number of extension courses, but they are not as liberally interpreted so far as educational upgrading is concerned as the on-campus courses. And that is the reason why I feel that with a college or university here, it would be beneficial, particularly to the upgrading of our teachers and presumably make it possible for us to get better teachers or at least better qualified, and to maintain better qualified

teachers.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Doctor, where do your students at Hartnell go after they finish their two years?

DR. CHING: Those that go on go to San Jose, Cal Poly, Stanford, some to U. C. and some to U. C. L. A.-- scattered generally. I think the greater number would go to San Jose State.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: In following along with Senator Farr's questioning there, I think and I may be wrong, but I think the Peninsula would be much better off to make an attempt to look into the branch, as we know it, of either San Jose State or some other state college here in your teacher problem. It is very ironic that you would have a summer session in Salinas for your teachers during that time and it would seem to me that if this problem were acute enough that we could possibly put enough pressure on San Jose State that they would establish a branch here for you, and to get it started along those lines rather than to try to jump into the establishment of a full-time four-year college at this particular moment. I am not saying that you are not entitled to it, but I think we as legislators, and I know all of us on the Committee here, are interested in education or we wouldn't be here, but there is a little problem of money.

DR. CHING: Always.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: And I think that it would be much better for you to pursue the lines of a branch

of one of the other state colleges here to get you started for your particular problem that you have in mind, and then as you grow, why, your needs will then go even to your four-year college, but to visualize a state college in any one of these areas right now, I can tell you, Doctor, that it is practically out the window. It just isn't going to happen because of the fact that it takes about 30 million dollars to establish a state college, and we are going to be looking around for a lot of millions come January 4 or 5.

So I just would like to have some thinking from some of your other people along the lines that we are going to have to settle for something that will satisfy the needs of the particular area here as a stop-gap affair to build up to it and then possibly in five or six years we can come along and say, "Now, here is a need and it is shown to be needed." It would be much easier to go to the Legislature then for an institution, a complete four-year institution.

What I was wondering, what happens to those students--that is the reason I asked that question. Are they dropping away--let's go a little bit further on this. Are they dropping away after their two years at Hartnell because of the fact that there is no place for them to go in most cases or are your needs handled from that standpoint?

DR. CHING: I think I can answer that in the same terms that you answered the matter of providing funds for a state college. If a person has to send his child 60 miles

or a hundred miles and provide for food and clothing and housing and so on, he is less apt to do it than if the college is here. The answer is obviously "yes". We would be better taken care of if there were within the area an institution where we wouldn't have to provide lodging and food.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: What does it cost a student to go to Hartnell?

DR. CHING: It doesn't cost anything other than --I mean it is tax-free, of course. I shouldn't say tax-free. It is tuition-free although the County Superintendents recognize a college tuition bill that we pay and all of us pay. But the student himself does not pay a tuition. The student pays for text books and to join the student association and whatever he pays in the way of food and lodging and so on if he comes and resides within the area. Our area is rather large, over 100 miles in length, and there are students who come from the southern part of the county who live in Salinas to go to our college.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: What is your tax rate now?

DR. CHING: Our tax rate is 35 cents.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Doctor, have you got any estimate of what it does cost a student, I mean in round figures? You have gone around saying what you think they have to pay for it. Has there ever been an estimate in dollars and cents?

DR. CHING: You mean at Hartnell or a state college?

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: At Hartnell?

DR. CHING: No, I haven't.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: We have been speaking about a teacher recruiting problem. Do you have any problem of recruiting your faculty in Hartnell?

DR. CHING: Only in those fields that are difficult to secure teachers regardless of price. We pay, I think, above average in salaries in the state, in fact, I know very considerably above average for Hartnell. We are very fortunate that we have the means whereby we can do that. So we have had no particular problem except in the field of science and that is an area that is difficult for anyone regardless of what your salary schedule might be.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no other questions, thank you very much, Doctor, for your testimony. I think at this time we will take a five-minute break so that the young lady can rest her fingers. I understand the photographer wants to take a picture.

MRS. LEFFINGWELL: You were asking about the cost for students. Our son went to Hartnell College and the estimated cost--he lived at home and rode the bus, and the estimated cost was about $75.00 a semester.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. We will take that five-minute recess now.

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: The meeting will please come to order. I am going to have to change my agenda a little because we have several people here that want to testify and they want to get away at noon time if possible. Our next witness will be Gordon Sinclair of Santa Cruz, editor of the Santa Cruz Sentinel.

MR. SINCLAIR: As a resident and interested citizen of Santa Cruz County, I would like to express our appreciation upon the interest of the Assembly Committee on Education and the Subcommittee for Higher Education for conducting this hearing today.

We feel there is a definite need for the establishment of a state college in our area--the district designated 8-c (Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties) in The Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California study.

Our belief is emphasized by two facts that we believe demonstrate the need for additional centers of higher education in this area:

1. The fact that student enrollment in the public schools of the three counties in the area is running far ahead of previous estimates. (In the school year 1960-61, the number of graduates from high schools in the area will be as great as was estimated by the state for the year 1970-71--10 years ahead of the state projection.

2. San Jose State college, the nearest state college

to the populated areas of the district, is already crowded to capacity with little hope that planned new construction there will be able to keep up with increased enrollment demands. For illustration, there are today 5000 seniors in Santa Clara county high schools, but in the first grades in Santa Clara county schools there are 13,100 students so that it is questionable whether San Jose State will be able to handle the potential enrollment from Santa Clara county in 1970.

As you know, the University of California is planning to establish a general campus within the five-county area of San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey counties to relieve enrollment pressure on the Berkeley campus in the near future.

While this campus will provide facilities for university-level education for the students of the South Central Coastal region, there will still be the need for a state college in the area of Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties.

At the present time, Monterey county has two fine junior colleges, Hartnell college at Salinas and Monterey Peninsula college here in Monterey. San Benito county has a small junior college at Hollister and the citizens of Santa Cruz county recently voted for the establishment of a county junior college with a rousing 70 percent majority.

Therefore, it is evident that the citizens of the area realize their responsibilities at the local level support of junior colleges as an integral part of the three-segment system

of higher education in California.

We have then, local citizens providing junior colleges, the University of California establishing a University campus, and we need only the establishment of a state college to complete the desired three-segment plan of higher education for the central coastal counties.

We realize that it would require some time to gain a state college should we be so fortunate as to gain the approval of the Legislature and the subsequent actions of the State Board of Public Works and the Department of Education.

We have, however, estimated the enrollment of a state college in this area, using the assumption that it could open for freshmen students in the fall of 1962. Our amateur forecast estimates an enrollment of 2887 students at the first four-year period of 1965-66.

If we were to take the figures from the state study in Santa Clara county in 1955, a state college in this area, obtaining an enrollment of 22.6 percent of the high school graduating classes, starting in 1962, would have first year enrollments of 790, 854, 916, and 992 for a four-year total of 3552, assuming that junior college transfers and transfer from other areas would account for the drop-out of initial students.

We do not presume to be experts in the field of estimating enrollment, but are submitting these forecasts for your guidance as preliminary information in the study of the need for a state college in this area.

Also enclosed in this statement is a report on current enrollment in public schools in the three counties as well as the state projection from the 1955 study.

In addition to the estimates and report, I have enclosed a summary from the "Survey of Graduation Class at Santa Cruz High School" for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958, compiled by Placement Director C. R. Smith, which shows follow-up information on the graduates there.

This data, I believe, shows the tremendous interest in higher education from a high school district, where at the present time, there is no institution of higher education.

I'm sure that we all feel that today, and in the years ahead, higher education is an absolute necessity for every mentally-able person if we are to meet the challenges of the future, both as individuals and as loyal members of our nation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Mr. Sinclair. Are there are any questions anyone on the Committee has?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Sinclair, assuming that there is the potential for both University campus somewhere in a larger area than we are speaking of for a state college and the establishment of a state college in the three-county area, in your estimation which would more properly fit the needs of Santa Curz which I think you represent?

MR. SINCLAIR: Well, I think certainly a

greater percentage of the students would go to a state college than would to a university. We feel that in our own example or situation that Santa Cruz, being one of the places looking for the university campus, we feel we might be better inclined for a university campus because of our proximity to San Mateo and Santa Clara County where the great bulk of the students in the university area are located. The 75 percent of those students would be in those counties rather than in Monterey, Santa Cruz or San Benito.

However, we feel that they are both a part of our system of higher education. Hardly the same situation would apply.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I am thinking in terms of competition which may or may not develop between either an establishment of a state campus as the first step or the establishment of the university as a first step, taking into consideration taking off the pressure from the University at Berkeley in the first instance and the local pressure of Santa Cruz in the second instance.

MR. SINCLAIR: Well, I think in a case there we are dealing with the majority of the students from out of the Santa Cruz area so that I think that probably the greatest need under the enrollment demands at the present time is at the university level, but certainly it is going to be at the state-college level in the future because we have more state colleges and greater growth.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If

not, thank you very much, Mr. Sinclair. Now, I am going to call on Mr. Jim Corley, who is Vice-President of the University of California and representing the University here this morning. Mr. Corley.

MR. CORLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Might I bring up Dr. Engelbert of the University Extension who will talk to the first part of our presentation? Mr. Chairman, I presented to you a brief statement which the University wishes to present to the Committee, beginning first with our University Extension program, which you requested in your letter to President Kerr of December 9. I might mention he is very sorry he could not be here as he is going to Los Angeles and asked me to come and represent him. In your letter to Dr. Kerr you asked that we answer the following questions: 1, what the University is presently doing in the way of Extension work in the three-county area; and in the presentation before you, we have some statistics, and Dr. Engelbert can speak to those and answer questions on that phase of the presentation.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: All right.

DR. ENGELBERT: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as Mr. Corley has stated, figures giving the break-down of the activity of the University Extension in the three-county areas is presented in this statement. It shows that last year, 1957-58, we had a total of 1,040 enrollment in courses, correspondence and conferences. By far the largest amount was in Monterey County, both in classes and correspondence

Santa Cruz County had a distinguished number of enrollments as well. San Benito County had a very much smaller amount. You will note also that we have given some 21 courses in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties last year, 7 of them were in the field of education and were for credit. Courses were offered in the Cities of Monterey, Salinas, Santa Cruz and Watsonville. We have also, of course, great activity in the field of agricultural extension. The number of adult meetings and attendance as you will note from the figures on page 2 go well above 20,000. And adult meetings and, of course, the work that is being done in connection with the 4-H and other areas is a very large part of the University program.

In addition to these figures, let me make some general comments about University Extension activities which is the continuing education field of the University in this regional area. Our work has been increasing and indeed this year I think we have been giving more attention, 1958-59, to this regional area than any other area in the northern half of the state largely because we find that now we have an increasing number of requests for work in the various University Extension departments from this area. We find it is an area of high cultural background and there is a large demand for continuing work of postgraduate work as well as work at the University level in education.

This year, 1958-59, will show very considerable expansion over the year 1957-58 in our activities.

With respect to the work for education and particularly teachers working on credentials, we are expanding our work and will do more of it in the future. As a matter of fact, we are now undergoing a reorganization in our Education Department in Extension and we plan to expand our offerings. This will be one area which is marked for further development.

In giving you these comments about University Extension, I am not trying to detract in any way from the need for a University campus or a state college because even though these institutions are present we still have demands and will have increased demands upon University Extension for work in the professional fields and the cultural fields.

I think it would be fair to say, however, that in the past, in the recent past, this area has perhaps not received as much attention from University Extension as it should have, partly because, and I speak with candor, here our bias has been in the larger metropolitan areas and simply because we are 85 percent self-supporting, only 15 percent of our support coming from the state, and we tend to gravitate to the areas where you have the larger enrollments making it therefore for us much more costly to undertake as was noted here in the earlier presentation programs in the semi-rural areas.

But we are planning to expand our work in the field of education particularly and more generally in all fields in this regional area, and this is being done this year.

Now, these are the general comments I had to make that

go along with the statistics which you have before you. I will be happy to answer any questions on the first part of this presentation, namely that part dealing with the University Extension activities in the three-county area under consideration.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: What percent of the courses offered in these four cities were for credit?

DR. ENGELBERT: I think that about 75 percent of them were, three-quarters of them were for credit.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

DR. ENGELBERT: All of the education courses were.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Doctor, how are you going about answering some of the need that we heard this morning on the provisional teachers? Does this come under your Extension work or can it come under your Extension work?

DR. ENGELBERT: Yes, and this was implied in my comment that we are undergoing a reorganization of our Department of Education in Extension in cooperation with our School of Education. We plan to broaden the number of courses that we shall give as well as our service to outlying areas. By outlying areas, I mean areas that are not in heavy population concentrations, the immediate metropolitan area, for example, of San Francisco. So that even this year, I am sure that our work will show in this regional area a stepped-up pace. I point

out again we have some limits upon what we can do in view of our own financial support. In other words, we could do much more work naturally down here if the question of self-support were not always as dominant as it is.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: I was going to ask one question. Doctor, how many requests from this particular area have you had that you weren't able to service? Do you know off-hand?

DR. ENGELBERT: I am sorry I don't have those figures. I do know, however, we are getting an increasing number of them because we have been moving down into this area and this has been the whetting the appetite of people here to come in for conferences, special institute classes, and so forth.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Are you speaking of the teaching profession or would that be over and above that?

DR. ENGELBERT: Over and above that.

SENATOR FARR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question of Dr. Engelbert. Do you feel that the University Extension Division or perhaps the state colleges could provide qualified persons, that is to say, persons who have an AB Degree who want to be teachers, the necessary teacher credentials work through the University Extension? I know of one particular situation where a parent in this community has several children. The children were rather small. She wanted to get her teacher's credentials, but she had to go to San Jose State and become a resident on the campus. Also she spent part

of her time as a resident on the campus of Berkeley. Is it possible through the University Extension to enable these people with AB Degrees to take the teachers' credential training through some kind of satellite activity, perhaps directed through a junior college?

DR. ENGELBERT: Well, I do not want to speak for the School of Education. And whereas some adjustments would have to be made, I would feel that it would be entirely possible through the University and University Extension in cooperation with the School of Education, and I am only speaking for the University now, to develop a program to meet the shortages of teachers in terms of credentials.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Pardon me. Is there not now an existing residence requirement as far as a certificate is concerned?

DR. ENGELBERT: There is.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: That is what I wanted to bring out.

DR. ENGELBERT: But there are provisional credentials which can be obtained.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: But for the final certificate at the present time and under the present law a certain residential work has to be accomplished?

DR. ENGELBERT: Yes.

MR. CORLEY: That is in the state law, not the University.

DR. ENGELBERT: A larger number of teachers are now teaching on the provisional credential. It is not wholly satisfactory, but it is a means of upgrading to the point where they are acceptable to the local school districts.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: The law would have to be changed if we wanted to do it the way the Senator suggests?

DR. ENGELBERT: To do the whole thing, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Dr. Corley, would you object to changing the law that would cause a residential procedure to be--

MR. CORLEY: Don't ask me. I wouldn't.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Fine.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions by the Committee? This gentleman here I believe had a question.

MR. CAGNEY: There are two ways of getting credentials, regular credentials now. One is by way of completing training at a teacher training institution. Another one for those that have the academic requirements with two years of experience can also receive a credential. This does not require any in-residence. There are people who have Bachelors Degrees who have a given number of units and can teach two years and get a credential without any further residence being supplied.

MR. CORLEY: They are provisional for two years.

MR. CAGNEY: Yes, but eventually they don't

have to satisfy a residence to get a credential.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, we want to thank you for your presentation. Dr. Corley, would you now continue?

MR. CORLEY: Beginning on page 2, Mr. Chairman, may I answer the second half of your letter which asks for the future plans of the University in this area and the opinion of the University relative to the establishment of a state college in this area. I believe that last Wednesday, in my opinion, one of the historical marks of cooperation and unified effort was begun between the State Board of Education and the University with renewed vigor. The State Board of Education and the Regents Liaison Committee last Wednesday met and considered many of the problems which you gentlemen have been considering during the past few years in the expansion of higher education. There are a number of new members of both boards and they have signified a determined effort to try and coordinate both the state college expansion and the University expansion to avoid duplication of facilities and the necessary expense that goes with that expansion, feeling that there is just so much money to go around and if properly allocated by a coordinated effort of the two boards, that taxpayers will be saved a considerable expense and avoid duplication of this educational facility in various parts of the state within the limited funds.

I think that now we are in a renewed cooperative effort to try to solve this problem of higher education with you

gentlemen and we hope we can do it to avoid what has happened in Orange County. That was what stimulated their effort to say, how can the state afford two facilities in Orange County? It is 25 million dollars to 30 million dollars each, it is 5 to 7 or 8 million dollars annual expense and both the regents and board said something must be done to coordinate the efforts rather than duplicate it and we are hopeful that something can be done even if we have to revise or ask you to revise the law that was passed two years ago, whichever is for the best interests of higher education, and the two boards hope they can help you solve it.

In 1957 the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University reported the need of additional centers in public higher education in California. This study as of now is the guiding light for the University in the establishment and location of new campuses.

As reported in this study on the basis of California population growth, the University will experience tremendous enrollment increases in the years immediately ahead.

By 1970, the University will have approximately 100,000 students.

As Dr. Ching said this morning, that represent approximately four to five percent of those that are eligible out of the ten or eleven that graduate from high schools. Despite the fact we have the high entrance requirement, we still will have approximately 100,000 students to take care of by 1970.

Our present enrollment is approximately 43,000 and that means two-and-a-half times what we have at the present time. The joint staff which prepared this study on additional centers of higher education did not include recommending new centers but only the development of a priority list for such institutions. The report gave the next highest priority after Southern California metropolitan area the establishment of a University campus in the so-called South Central Coast section, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey Counties.

The Regents of the University have determined after extremely careful study that three new campuses of the University will be established in the immediate future--that is providing funds are available--in La Jolla area, southeast Los Angeles-Orange County area, and the South Central Coastal section.

For the past year the Regents have been conducting extensive studies to determine the specific location in which these campuses should be situated. In the South Central Coastal section, the region of immediate interest to this Committee, these studies have been conducted with the assistance of the architectural-planning consulting firm of Livingston & Warnecke. Analyses have been made of the many factors to be considered in connection with the selection of the new campus site, and active consideration of these studies is not being given by the administration and Regents of the University. Nearly 100 sites have been considered within this region, approximately 10 sites within the five-county area remain for further study

and analysis. Visits have been made within past weeks to all of these counties, and consideration continues of possible sites within the area of immediate interest to this Committee.

At this point, it simply can be stated that the Regents are endeavoring to conclude their consideration, and it is anticipated that within the next few months a decision will be made as to the location of the site in this South Central Coastal section which will be best serve the needs of higher education in the general region and for the state. It is noted that the study of the need for additional centers of education, jointly accepted by the State Board of Education and the regents as a planning guide reported, ". . . all three counties--Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito--had increases in the number of high school graduates between 1950-51 and 1954-55, but they are below the state average."

In assigning priorities for new state colleges, the study placed the Monterey-Santa Cruz area in sixth place of thirteen areas considered, in terms of estimated enrollments, after Alameda, San Bernardino-Riverside, Contra Costa, Kern and Stanislaus Counties.

While these priorities were not approved as such, the following statement of policy proposed by the study with respect to them was approved by both the State Board of Education and the Regents: "The interest of the state, both educationally and financially, will best be served if such new institutions as may be approved by the State Board of Education and the

Regents of the University, and as may be provided for by the California Legislature, are established in descending order of estimated enrollments."

That was the basis on which the selections were made and the action by the Regents and by the State Board. And the activity of the Regents in this area, I think, can be demonstrated by Senator Farr, Assemblyman Pattee, and Glen Coolidge.

No decision as yet has been made, but we are hopeful that we can come to your during the Session with a definite report and recommendation. We did make available some money for site acquisition or at least for down payments at the last Session and we are proceeding on the basis of these three new campuses at the present time. The Orange County one, however, remains for further study and discussion with the community and the legislators and the State Board of Education to determine whether we should have two or one in that area at this time with limited funds. That is the position that the University has at the moment.

We are moving ahead based on the report which was presented to you two years ago. We are following that as our guide.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. Are there questions from the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I want to ask one. On this last statement, is it to be interpreted that insofar as priorities, and are you speaking here of priorities for institutions of higher education, per se, or priorities insofar as

the University of California is concerned? Since both the State Board of Education and the Regents are included in this statement, I presume it was the former.

MR. CORLEY: That is correct. That is on the higher education generally. And that is what the two boards hope to bring, a coordination between the two priority lists.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Are the priorities to be established primarily on the descending order of estimated enrollments?

MR. CORLEY: That is the present Bible. I mean it is this book that was adopted by both boards. It is the present thinking of the Liaison Committee as of last Wednesday.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: And that actually has characteristically and at present taken more consideration than geography?

MR. CORLEY: That is correct, to meet the need of numbers of the people as we foresee it that are coming to the various phases of education.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: And as a matter of fact, on the three statements of locations that you have in this report of the La Jolla area, the southeast Los Angeles-Orange County area, and the South Central Coastal section--these three were taken as having for practical purposes the same kind of priority and you are approaching these simultaneously?

MR. CORLEY: Yes. The one inference in the San Diego area was the fact that we had a small area established

already and it would be less costly to go there as we did to Riverside.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: That is actually under way now, isn't it?

MR. CORLEY: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: And those from Orange County can commute to San Diego.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: We can commute to Riverside a lot easier.

SENATOR FARR: I would be very much interested in knowing what this statement means. I know Assemblyman Pattee and I would like to know what this statement means for Monterey from the standpoint of extension of the University or a state college. Does this mean they are going to be located strictly on the basis of descending order of estimated enrollments and as of what year, present estimated enrollments or estimated enrollments in 1980?

MR. CORLEY: This book, Senator Farr, is the guiding light for both boards at the moment and if you will look on page 90, the report of the Santa Clara campus, as a college, but it includes the five counties, would be in the neighborhood of 8300 by 1965, and 11,900 for the University by 1970, and the state college in order of priority, it seems to me, was around--here it is on page 49--was in 1965-66, 3300; in 1970-71 it would be 3800. Now, this was in the order of greatest need as was estimated at that time and I assume,

although conditions change very rapidly, these figures would not vary too greatly.

We are hoping that each year we can bring these figures up to date in order to guide the two boards in the decisions that are made.

SENATOR FARR: How soon are you going to make your definite decision?

MR. CORLEY: I hope within the next two months. I was told I could make that statement, within the next two months a recommendation on a selection in this area of site would be definite. The Regents have made their decision in the five-county area already and it has been accepted by the State Board of Education as the first priority for higher education in the area and we are proceeding on that basis at the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: You say they have made their decision?

MR. CORLEY: Not as to the location, but there will be a campus in the five-county area. That is why we are studying the sites.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: After you purchase or obtain land, how long will it be before you start building?

MR. CORLEY: That will be determined a lot, Mr. Pattee, on you and other members of this Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: There is one other question. I understand that the Sonoma-Marin area, they have

already purchased land, is that right?

MR. CORLEY: I don't think so.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: You mean for a state college?

ASSEMBLYMAN PATTEE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: No, they have not.

MR. CORLEY: They have had hearings and I think it has been offered to them.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: I think for the record somebody said today there was a state college established in the Sonoma-North Bay Area and in Stanislaus. They have not been established by the Legislature. All the Legislature did was to acquire sites, but the Legislature never has actually--they only established Alameda and Orange County, but they never established the other two areas. They gave money to buy the site.

MR. CORLEY: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Pardon me, in connection with the site location itself and arising out of the Wednesday meeting, would it not be logical that the establishment of the site by the University would have a very definite determination on the establishment of a site for any other institution of higher learning?

MR. CORLEY: Oh, definitely. That is why it needs coordination.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Since you are in the field first, it would seem to me, it would follow also that a

reappraisal of the balance between service by junior colleges and the university level would be important to determine the service then of the state college.

MR. CORLEY: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Since you are in the field first, I think we might foresee from this Committee's standpoint that a look-see after you have had your program under way might be advantageous.

MR. CORLEY: That was exactly the statement made at the board meeting, joint meeting last Wednesday. They felt exactly that same way.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Have any of the counties within these five counties offered land to the University for sites?

MR. CORLEY: Oh, yes. We have had over 100 proposals.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Gratis?

MR. CORLEY: There have been several that are very generous.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Free?

MR. CORLEY: (Nodding assent.)

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Jim, I would like to ask you this question. If a university were established here, what service did you or your board have in mind that they would cater to? I know most of the cases where a university has been established where they have gone in for various services

and concentrated on certain types of service for the area. Now, are you thinking of possibly an agricultural establishment here more than higher education or science or engineering or something along that line?

MR. CORLEY: Well, the statement that the Regents have used--if they--of course, the general education is basic to any university or state college, but in an attempt to have a specialization that will not duplicate the specialties in every other campus of the university and not try to repeat Berkeley or Los Angeles or Santa Barbara at every campus we go to, but they will attempt some specialties in graduate work and upper division work in certain fields, and the area would influence tremendously what they would do, because according to the reports, 65 percent of the students will come from this area.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRISTCHGI: The point I was getting to, would in your mind, would you feel that an establishment of a university in the area here, that they could solve probably a good majority of the problems that arising at the present time from the folks here in the area?

MR. CORLEY: We would hope so. There are some that probably we could not, but we would hope to try to solve as many of the problems as possible. That's been our function and that would serve the area best as well as the state as a whole.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Corley, the question

keeps coming in my mind, is your projection of enrollment in the University by 1970 up to 100,000, and I believe the state colleges are going to grow just about at the same rate of speed, maybe a little faster.

MR. CORLEY: Faster.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Now, I am wondering in the next 10 or 11 years how we are going to get enough money to take care of all of this new enrollment that we are going to have in that short period of time at the progress we are making and the rapidity of the progress we are making. It just seems to me if the universities and the state college, State Department of Education could definitely decide on where these colleges are to be located, then the Legislature should approve them and make provision to buy the site even though the colleges aren't developed for several years due to the fact that three or four or five years or ten years from now the sites probably will be three or four times as costly as they are today.

MR. CORLEY: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: You feel that we should get down more to a specific program and get the locations established?

MR. CORLEY: That is right.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: As soon as possible.

MR. CORLEY: That is our opinion and that is exactly what the two boards expressed last Wednesday. It is time for them to give you guidance on what they think a division

of labor can be and where the various segments of higher education should be located and to avoid this expense that they realize will be phenomenal. I don't know how we are going to stop the population growth.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Well, I don't think we can stop the population growth, but I think the expansion should be coordinated and I don't think there should be duplication, particularly where we need expansion in so many different areas of the state.

MR. CORLEY: If I might offer a suggestion, I do believe that Dr. Engelbert, of the University Extension, and the facilities of the University Extension will go a long way to help in solving some of these problems. Also I hope, and I am making a plea for something that I think will be helpful if we do a little more experimenting, and I think that is television, that it can be a helpful means of solving some of these problems. It can be useful and would be less expensive.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Well, there seems to have been in the past a little misunderstand between the University and maybe this Committee and maybe the State Board of Education, and I don't feel that that is a healthy condition. I think we are all going in the same direction and that we should coordinate these things and not have any duplications.

MR. CORLEY: Well, I think you can rest assured, Mr. Chairman, after what happened last Wednesday that you are well on the road to that.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you.

MR. CORLEY: From the State Board and Regents' point of view.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Could I just tie this down? Are we to infer from what you have said that you feel that with the establishment of the university campus plus the expansion of the University Extension, that there is not a need for a state college in this area?

MR. CORLEY: No, I did not say that.

MR. MARSHALL: What is your opinion on this?

MR. CORLEY: I must go by the book which says that even with the university campus at a later time a state college must be established because by 1970 they would have a population of approximately 3800.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, you see if we are talking about your establishment of the campus, for instance, in the San Mateo County area, if it is up at this end of this area, then perhaps there would be justifiably a need for something else down at this end of the South Coastal area.

MR. CORLEY: I think after one is established we should take another look and see what relief we get from it. The priority of these establishments by both state boards indicated that the university should come here first. That is the guide that we are using since it was adopted by both boards without prejudice to a state college coming at a later time.

I think this was a priority of need to be served first.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, do you think that you will be able to take care of as many students as if you had a state college here?

MR. CORLEY: I think it was expressed this morning that the number of students that come, that are eligible for university is considerably less than are eligible for a state college. I think in numbers that is not--although the figures here indicate 3800 as against 8300 for a university, and 11,000 by 1970--now, those are the figures by experts that studied it. I have to go by what they have said.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I think we have to be realistic about this, though. I think if there is a university established in this area, there isn't going to be a state college established so quickly. I think probably there will be in due time. There is so much need within the state for establishment of one institution or the other. I don't think we are going to put two here in Monterey County, and I think we have got to face that situation. That is my observation, anyway. If there are no other questions, I think we will adjourn for lunch and reconvene at 2:00 o'clock.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken.)

Monday, December 15, 2:00 o'clock, P.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Will the meeting come to order. Before we start out with our testimony, I overlooked a very important introduction this morning and I am saving it until now. I have on my left here Carl Conelly, Chairman of the Santa Cruz County Committee on School Reorganization. Mr. Conelly has done much to arrange this meeting today through his assistance to Assemblyman Coolidge and Assemblyman Pattee. I certainly appreciate your fine program, Mr. Conelly.

Now, the first witness that we are going to call on is Dr. Frederick Huber, Monterey Peninsula College, Monterey. Dr. Huber.

DR. HUBER: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think I am probably in a little more fortunate position by being able to rely on some of the material that was brought up this morning in addressing my remarks to the members of the Committee. It seems to me one of the items that was brought up this morning relative to the niche the junior college has and that the state college has in the total program is of interest also to me. Dr. Ching pointed this out. I would like to comment just on one more phase of this and that is the fact that the junior college is capable as one of its multiple purposes of offering the first two years of the four-year college or university and it has been my experience, having lived in two other counties other than Monterey and being in

the junior college field in those two counties, that this is a significant fact for the establishment of a four-year institution.

Now, for example, in Orange County, which was referred to this morning, I was at Orange Coast College for a period of 8 years and during that time Long Beach State College was developed and I know that there was a great deal of concern on the part of the three junior colleges in Orange County when Long Beach State College made some attempt, and I think actually followed through for the expansion of their lower division program.

It is also true, I think, that the junior college, and this was pointed out here this morning, that the junior college is capable of providing those first two years as well as the two-year program for those people who are entering upon a vocation which requires less than a Bachelors Degree and also the program of adult education and the evening division. So that I--one of my first concerns would be what type of four-college, as far as the actual program--is the emphasis going to be in lower division? If so, in words of one of the members of the Committee, I would be chary of the program of higher education. On the other hand, I think I should indicate to the Committee that I am very much concerned about the program of higher education. I sincerely feel that the junior college is a part of that program of higher education and that in any development naturally the program of the junior college is to

considered.

We, fortunately, in this area do have the additional junior college facilities to be developed in Santa Cruz which will give really three junior colleges serving these--well, actually four junior colleges with San Benito serving these three county areas.

The other point that I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee, which perhaps it is not pertinent in this particular situation, and that is in Alameda County. Now, as I understood from the statement this morning, that Alameda County was one of the areas in which a junior college would definitely be established. In other words, there is approval for it.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: You mean state college?

DR. HUBER: State college, excuse me. The point that interests me in this statement that has been developed by the Joint Committee--it is pointed out there that no state college, or at least no attempt to establish a state college would be made unless there was a junior college established there adequately serving that particular community and here in Alameda we see the situation which is not existing there. And so it brings me to a particular point and that is--I came here on July 1. I received a letter immediately thereafter from the Executive Secretary of this joint liaison Commmittee which developed this particular report and in there he had addressed a letter to the five junior college Presidents or Directors

relative to certain questions, and I replied to those questions as best I could and then I in turn asked if the Junior College Presidents or the Junior College Directors could not be brought together to discuss further this program of development of higher education in these county areas which you are considering here in your meeting this morning and this afternoon, and it falls in line with what was brought out this morning, and that is that this Joint Committee is the one who having developed this report would further look into the program of higher education in this areas that you have already indicated.

And I would be very much interested in being a part of this Committee. Now, perhaps being new in the area, I may be presumptuous to say that I am--that perhaps this information is all available and the things are pretty well laid out, but as I would gather from the comments that were made this morning, there is need for further study and it was pointed out by, I think, Dr. Corley from the University of California, that the Joint Committee now is working together to determine which facility which should be first and to determine whether there should be both facilities and this type of thing, and I think the junior college people should be involved in this particular thing.

I would certainly want to bring this point to the attention of the Committee, that we definitely would like to be involved if for just the point that was brought out here a little earlier, about what type of program there should be

in the lower division.

I am of the opinion that the junior college can, as Dr. Ching pointed out this morning, match the program whether it is of the state college or whether it is a branch of the University. It can match the program of lower division in quality and in possibility of instruction.

Now, asfar as Monterey Peninsula College is concerned, I might bring you up to date on some of the facts relative to the institution and perhaps you would like to ask some questions in this regard.

First of all, the college is part of the high school district. We are a part of the Union High School District of Monterey. We have a student body this year of 1240 during the day and we have 1380 at night. We offer approximately the same program in the evening with some exceptions that we offer during the day. When I say the same program, that is, we offer a college program in the evening as well as during the day. We are an institution which is in the stage of development as are all programs of higher education. We are building for a student body of approximately 2500. We have just begun the initial step. We are in the second year of a building program which was based on an over-ride tax relative to our own particular district here. We have completed one building and we are embarking on a second building. This will take care of at least initial facilities, but we have a long building program up through the year 1970. We anticipate our enrollment--at least we are

planning on an institution of 2500. So we are an institution which is developing even though we are only a part--we are only a high school district junior college, yet we do serve the complete community, both Carmel and Pacific Grove and also as was pointed out by Mr. Lien this morning, students come to us from Santa Cruz County area--at least they have been coming and we will probably have a certain number until the college there is firmly established.

We have a faculty of around 65 who are drawn to us from various areas. Some of them have been on the college campus for the complete length of the existence of the college and others, for example, we hired I think this year 14 new persons of which 9 of them were replacements. So we are quite a stable institution.

We were accredited in 1953 by the Western College Association. We were given a full five-year period of accreditation. We are being revisited by the Western College Association in February of this next year and we are anticipating no problems. We are just preparing--in fact, our board tonight is going to receive its copy of the preliminary accreditation application for accreditation report.

Now, that in general, I think, gives you a little bit of the background, some of the pattern as we look at the state picture and this, of course, I am speaking only from the standpoint of having been in the junior college field for a number of years, and also my relationship in other areas.

Now, are there are questions that the members of the Committee would like to ask?

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: I think your testimony is very well put. You have looked at the overall view. Now, as a junior college person, I would be interested in asking just some general questions of you.

DR. HUBER: All right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: You say that you feel that junior colleges can offer a program of quality comparable to that offered in the University and the state colleges, is that correct?

DR. HUBER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Only the lower division level?

DR. HUBER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Have you had any--just talking about the operations program for a minute, do you have any concern about the difference in the level of expenditure in junior colleges on operations with the level of expenditure at state colleges and the University, the fact that your cost per student per year is less than 50 percent of the University cost?

DR. HUBER: Yes, in fact, I have this--I just picked out this statistical report from the state colleges. Yes, I am aware of that, Mr. Hegland, that it costs much less.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: You still feel it is of equal quality?

DR. HUBER: Yes, I do. I feel that in relation to our transfer of students, as an example, who transferred to a four-year college or university, there is not a great differential, but it is a minor one. As you probably know, to the University it is .94--

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: However, this is just one segment of your student population. This is just one criteria, is that right?

DR. HUBER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Let's go to the other problem. Do you feel with your local taxpayers here paying one-half the charge at least of your operations, and possibly 60 percent, and the total costs for schools construction that this is entirely fair to your property taxpayers?

DR. HUBER: I don't understand--what do you mean?

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Well, state colleges and universities are paid for with funds totally as far as construction goes on the state level and totally as far as operations from the state level.

Now, do you find any taxpayer resistance in this maintaining of equal quality with the local taxpayers paying this rather large slice?

DR. HUBER: Well, I don't think--I don't know whether I would word your question exactly the way you have

worded it because actually what the situation is, as has been pointed out here earlier, we all have our niche in this particular program of higher education in California, and the junior college does have its place. I think it is well established, its place in the program, but as to saying that because of the fact that we do not spend the amount of money that the state college and University does, therefore, we have a program of lesser quality, I don't think that necessarily adds up.

Now, as to whether our taxpayer is getting the benefit at Monterey Peninsula College--I believe our taxpayer is getting the benefit of the money that is spent there.

Now, you turn to the four-year college and University and the obvious answer is, yes, they are getting the benefit of their tax dollar at those institutions. The question here, of course, is first, should an institution of higher learning come into this area and offer the same program perhaps or emphasize the program of lower division education, and I would say no. I don't think they should. I think we should tie in together and that is why I mentioned here earlier to the Committee that there should be some coordination, as was pointed out this morning, between the high school principals, between the junior college directors and presidents, between the state college presidents and certainly between the Regents of the University.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Which does not obtain now. These questions are not meant to be critical. The third area

has to do with your operating your junior college in a unified district in connection with a high school.

DR. HUBER: It is a union high school district. Yes, sir, that is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Do your junior college teachers teach as many hours as your high school teachers and do they receive unified salary schedule, the same salaries they are getting in high school?

DR. HUBER: There is not a single salary schedule.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: In other words, you pay your junior college people more?

DR. HUBER: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: And do they teach fewer hours or the same number of hours your high school teachers do?

DR. HUBER: No, I don't know. They operate the same number of hours as do the high school people. It is just a question of whether you say you are on a particular--on the campus a certain number of hours. For high school you have five to six hours a day and the same thing applies to junior college.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Now, do you feel that higher education, that you can offer higher eduction--this is a loaded question--under ideal circumstances with your faculty carrying the same classroom load as your high school teachers carry?

DR. HUBER: Well, I think we can do it in one or two ways. First of all, we can have perhaps additional faculty which would, if you were talking about classes of 35 or 40 in

size--I do believe you are dealing with the students who at least as far as age are concerned is a little older and we would hope that student also is more mature and would take upon himself a great deal more responsibility for his work and doing his own work. I think, too, you must also take into consideration in determining as far as load is concerned whether the faculty has an opportunit to actually provide a program relative to the student who comes there. In other words, they have smaller classes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Do they in your system? Is the average class load, and this is my last question, Mr. Chairman, on this--is your class load substantially lower in your junior college classes per class per faculty member than it is in the high school?

DR. HUBER: In the situation here at Monterey, it is, yes, because the fact they are tremendously overcrowded in their facilities at the present time.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Do you feel that you would do a better job toward this equality of education if you were able to duplicate to a little bit better extend the conditions at state colleges and universities on, say, teaching load and salary?

DR. HUBER: Well, you are talking about could we use more money, which is what it amounts to. Certainly, we could develop our facilities more extensively. We could offer an even broader program, in some instances, for example, maybe

in the course of a full two years we have to stagger some of our programs. That is possible.

On the other hand, you will have the situation where the program that we offer in two years for a student, regardless of whether he is transferring, whether he is going to terminate his education or whether he is merely there for his own improvement and enrichment, we feel we can still accomplish his objectives.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Do you feel perhaps you retain local control in the expenditure of funds and that perhaps is one of the reasons why you are able to offer the same caliber of training at a smaller cost?

DR. HUBER: I think this is a generally accepted fact that this is possible in the junior college.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: You don't subscribe to the theory it is necessary to send your tax money to Sacramento and handle it many more times before you get a better caliber instruction?

DR. HUBER: This is a loaded question. No, I think maybe I should have come this morning instead of this afternoon. They have had time to think during lunch, I can see. In all fairness, in answer to your question, I think it is quite true that with ability for local control, I feel that the junior college program here with the close cooperation with the local boards and with the close cooperation of the citizens'

committees, we are truly a community college. In other words, I feel that we reflect the community and I think this is, after all, the basis the junior college has been established on and we serve the people in our community. Certainly from the standpoint of a four-year college, a state college or the University, I think it, too, would reflect in general the community which it serves. I think this is true.

Knowing a place like Riverside or Los Angeles State or San Fernando Valley, or Fresno, I think they do. I think it was pointed out here this morning that they do reflect the communities or the student or the peoples which they serve. On the other hand, we are just a little bit closer to that particular base and so I think your question probably would be answered in that way.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: You will never make a good socialist.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel like I ought to clear up this position. I think this has to be seen in your whole approach on your college and the establishment of what institution of higher learning you are going to have here. First of all, would I be fair in saying that a proper niche for a junior college would be in these areas, first to serve those students on a local level who do not have the finances or for other reasons who could not go beyond their community for their first two years of work and yet who are qualified to go on in higher education?

DR. HUBER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: This is one of the fundamental areas of service, is that correct?

DR. HUBER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: And secondly, another area is a very principal area of your service and it would be for vocational training for terminal students above the high school level and particularly where these are being readied for basic technical jobs in commerce and industry. Would that be correct?

DR. HUBER: Yes, I think if I can--I want to make one comment on this and that is I think sometimes the use of the term "vocational" has connotations which some people feel puts it strictly in a class which should not be in a college situation. I think it ought to be pointed out there are so many occupations which require training less than an A.B. Degree. We are here in an area surrounded by at least half-a-dozen of these electronic laboratories.

Now, we have a program in electronic techniques. That is, we are training people who at the end of two years are employable and we work very close with these electronic laboratories. In fact, we have representatives from these laboratories who form a lay committee who sit with our people, curriculum people, and people who are developing the program and are instructors in the program to help us work on these programs to make sure we are developing a type of program which will make these people employable. I merely wanted to enlarge on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I think you are saying what I am saying, enlarging on what I mean by basic techniques, because as I see it, and if we may relate our higher learning to just one segment of our society, to wit, our industry, it seems to me in any industry to the extent it is becoming technical, you have the base of technicians who are those technicians on the lower level who represent the largest amount of employees, and then over and above that will be technicians who may require an A.B. Degree.

DR. HUBER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: And then there will be the research scientists who will have to have even above that.

DR. HUBER: That is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: My scope in approaching this technical portion of it would be the junior college on the basic level, the state college on, say, the supervisor or foreman level, and then for the scientist and researcher above that the University level.

DR. HUBER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Which would seem to me would set the logical niches as far as this field is concerned.

DR. HUBER: I would accept that.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Would you say the third level as far as the junior college is concerned is of some kind of a demand and need in every community for continuing education which may have no formal bound to it whatsoever?

DR. HUBER: That is correct. I would accept those.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Now, it seems to me that if this is right and we start from the junior college, then we go to the state college and say here that the emphasis in the state college certainly should not be on striking at vocational training where it hits these basic technicians, and it seems to me that we should--you as a junior college person should be urging this Committee and other persons interested in education to see that state colleges do not create four-year programs superimposed on your two-ear programs that bring out the same products.

DR. HUBER: True.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: That is the basic technique. Now, isn't this correct?

DR. HUBER: Very definitely.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: And it would follow in the same manner that to the extent that the junior colleges are adequately giving the two-year training for the person who has not the financial responsibility or other restrictions or who cannot go on to a university, that they do not need a state college to repeat that in the same community, is that correct?

DR. HUBER: When we say it doesn't have to repeat, certainly any institution of higher learning that would be brought into these communities or into this community would have to offer lower-division programs. I mean, in order to get itself off the ground. The only thing that would be of concern certainly to the junior college people is that they took into

consideration the fact that there were established junior colleges there who were doing the job and doing it quite satisfactorily and that in developing the program when they got to the point where they are in upper division and into graduate work, that there would be a gradual lessening of any emphasis in the lower-division program. I think this is the point that would be made because in the final analysis if you have these three levels, then they all should be a part of the picture and I don't think it is fair to shunt, and I am sure the Committee isn't considering this, but I want to make this point, it isn't fair to say that the junior college should only be taking care of those people who don't belong in the state college or in the University or who would be taking programs that would not be provided whatsoever, because I think we have this multiple role, as you have described, and even our students who come to us, we have a very high percentage of students who transfer, which is indicative of the quality of our work, and also the program that we offer.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: What percentage of transfers do you have at the present time?

DR. HUBER: Well, this last year it was around 68 percent of our students transferred.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: What do you have in your senior class, or what did you have last year?

DR. HUBER: 142.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Can you tell us from what area

you are drawing students at the present time?

DR. HUBER: Yes, we are drawing students from, naturally, the Peninsula area, from Carmel, Pacific Grove and Monterey. We draw--out of our 1240 students, we are drawing about 240 students from Santa Cruz County area. In addition to that we have close to 100 students from foreign countries. We have a very large number of students because of the presence of the Army Language School, Naval Post-Graduate School, and other areas. We have probably the highest number--I think we have the highest number except Los Angeles City College in our institution. So we also draw from neighboring--just as Dr. Ching--just as Hartnell does, from other high school districts which are not in any junior college district. We draw from other junior colleges and also from four-year colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: You gave us a figure and I think you said 2500 that you were anticipating.

DR. HUBER: This is the enrollment we are projecting and for which we hope to build our campus.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: What years?

DR. HUBER: This is 1965.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Is that on the basis of projection of figures of high school enrollment that we have already heard gone over in these areas?

DR. HUBER: Yes, that is right.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is important that we determine how well they are meeting that

problem on these lower two-year levels. That is one reason I have emphasized this niche and the proper fulfilment, because until that is being done properly we don't have a true evaluation of the picture. I thank you for your answer to the questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: You heard this morning the testimony that the University apparently has the first opportunity to come into this five-county area.

DR. HUBER: This was news to me.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: As an administrator on the junior college level, would you comment on the desirability of either the University or the state college coming into this community to serve the community in relation to its program and your program and in relation to the entrance requirements as compared with the University and the state college program?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Where is your next job going to be?

DR. HUBER: Well, first of all, I think it should be pointed out to the members of the Committee that much of the contact that I have had in the community since I have been here has been relative to the University of California. This is the first time that I have heard any active presentation relative to the program of the state college, so I mean I should tell you this before I even answer because of the contact I have had. I have been visited by representatives from the architects who are working with the Regents of the University.

I have also participated in presentation of the report similar to this before some representatives from the Regents and the President of the University. So that I have had no previous background relative to the state college except to know from this particular report here. Then, I believe the community from the standpoint of interest has reflected the four-year college rather than the University and I think this is something that should be taken into consideration. I am sure the people from the University are taking this into consideration as are you here today relative to the state college. I do think, too, that the presense of the University--this was part of a planning committee meeting which I was asked to attend on the impact of a university upon this area. So I very frankly, in order to be candid and answer your question, I feel that this is something that was brought out this morning which really needs to be studied more, or at least other factors brought into the picture to say honestly that a state college should be right here or the University should be here. Now, I think it is true that what was pointed out by Dr. Corley this morning, that both institutions are going to be needed in this area, or at least to serve this area. Now, this was news to me when he came out that the University has first bid, if I understand it correctly, that the University gets the first crack at this particular area. That was news to the Committee, too, this morning?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

DR. HUBER: I hadn't heard this before.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Do you like it this way--the University first and the state college perhaps later?

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: You mean both?

DR. HUBER: Well, I don't know. Actually, on the brief time I have been here I hate to comment and say this is what this particular area needs. I think probably the University being here would affect the junior college program less perhaps than the state college. I think that is true. I think if I would speak for members of the faculty who have reported to me relative to their feelings, they feel that perhaps the University again would have less effect, so if I am reflecting the community feelings and opinion and leaving my own personal convictions out of this particular thing because of not being really a part of this area a sufficient time to really know all of the factors that are involved, I think probably the University would be the first choice. I have explained to you the basis on which I think I would answer that question.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Maybe you can answer this. We know that education at the University is going to cost a little better than $2,000.00 a student. That has been the average cost. And the state college, I have seen figures as low as in the area of $800.00.

DR. HUBER: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: I know of a junior college

that is around 500.00. What is the cost in educating a student at your junior college?

DR. HUBER: Our present cost is around 395.00. That is our tuition cost for those in the district. For those from out of the district it is about 695.00--it is 300.00 on top of the other.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Does that include your construction costs? Is your tax rate up to 35 cents?

DR. HUBER: No, we have an additional over-ride tax of 20 cents.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Well, I wanted to get that into the record here because I think it is rather important. We are going to have to work out dollars and cents whether a lot of people like it or not. But, we are going to have these students and we want to give them a fair education. I think if the Committee is going to have to look on the fact we are going to have to encourage as many junior colleges as we can because if we can get those two basic years in for five to $600.00 a student as against maybe double that and triple and quadruple in the University, I think that it would be just common sense to go before the junior college and encourage them. But then, we will have to have an over-ride later on.

DR. HUBER: We are going to have to have this program of higher education. I think Dr. Ching's report this morning was excellent in indicating the need for higher education in this area. The fact that students must travel

distances means that they have housing, although I don't know what statistics there are relative to how many students do not go on to four-year college because of distances involved, but I think that certainly if this area, which has been selected by the University and the State Board of Education as an area of higher education, then I think we should look at this and say which one of these agencies seems to serve the needs of these counties the best and then let's go forth.

ASSEMBLY BRITSCHGI: Thank you. I just wanted to get that in the record.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no further questions, I want to thank you, Dr. Huber. I think you did an excellent job of answering--if I was a member of your board and you answered those questions, I would still compliment you.

DR. HUBER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I would like to call Dr. West, who is Dean of Education at San Jose State College. Dr. Wahlquist, who is President, called me and said he would be unable to be here and Dr. West would represent him here today at this hearing. Dr. West.

DR. WEST: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Joe West, Dean of Educational Services in Summer Sessions at San Jose State College. President Wahlquist asked me to express his regret that he could not be here today. He tried to get excused from this state meeting, but Dr. Vasche thought he should be present at a joint meeting of state college

and junior college presidents. He did send three of us to be here, however, and with your permission I would like to introduce them and they will help me on questions a little bit later. Dr. C. Grant Burton is passing out this material right now. He is our Executive Dean and he is in charge of our building program and is working on enrollment predicitions and plant capacity. Dr. Frank G. Wiley is a coordinator of our Extension Services. He is acquainted with Extension activities in this area and also has charge of our branch summer session operation at Hartnell College in Salinas. We hope that the three of us will be able to answer any question about San Jose State College.

President Wahlquist requested me to say to you that San Jose State College has no objection to a state college in the Monterey area. In fact, the administration feels that one should be approved at such time as the need can be established. The determination of this need, of course, does not rest with San Jose State College.

The accompanying figures are provided for whatever use they may be to the Committee. You may already have them. They are not designed to support or oppose the need for a college in Monterey County. San Jose State College representatives here today view their role in this hearing as primarily informative of the type of services which the college is presently offering to the Monterey area.

As you know, a number of students from this area attend regular day, evening, and summer session programs on-campus. In

addition, the college has for several years operated a branch summer session at Hartnell College in Salinas which Dr. Ching mentioned this morning, and Extension activities in Monterey County have been enlarged considerably with the establishment of Extension centers at Hartnell College and Monterey Peninsula College.

The college will be happy to provide additional information on request if you will let us know what you want.

At this time we will be glad to try to answer any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. May I ask my two colleagues to come up with on the assumption there will be some questions?

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Very happy to have them come forward.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I had just one question. Will you give the Committee a comparison between the student-draw for San Jose from Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties as against the student-draw from Santa Clara, San Mateo Counties?

DR. WEST: I don't have those figures with me, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Could you give us some idea? Why don't we pass that and let Dr. Burton go through his papers and maybe he could give us the answer whenever he is ready with it.

DR. WEST: Unless they wish to volunteer, I don't think they have a presentation to make.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I will pass that question

until we can get it.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Are there other questions from the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Dr. West, would you be willing or would the State College at San Jose be willing to embark upon a branch of San Jose State down here to get the program started?

DR. WEST: If it is determined and we sort of look to the State Department of Education to point the way on this, if it is determined that this is the solution, we would be happy to, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: Fine.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Do you have more call for courses from teachers with provisional credentials than you can offer classes under the present financial set-up?

DR. WEST: You mean by Extension or on-campus?

MR. MARSHALL: By Extension.

DR. WILEY: We try to meet the need however it is expressed for Extension courses, for provisional teachers, for the teachers who want professional growth credits or any other reason within the limitations imposed upon the Extension Division by the fact that we are a self-supporting operation. The state doesn't contribute any financial support whatsoever to the operations.

However, if you look at the figures you will see that in

Montery County we had last year from the three counties involved 1355 Extension registrations, largely at the two centers, at Hartnell College and Monterey Peninsula College.

In answer to your question, I would say only in unusual cases where they absolutely cannot provide us with a minimum class size to pay the instructor and the cost of transportation and so forth, that only in those cases do we have to decline.

MR. MARSHALL: We heard testimony this morning from San Benito County that their teachers were unable to get their credentials because nothing in the area--there was no place to get it, to take the courses.

DR. WILEY: Well, San Benito County has an occasional class in Hollister once a year or something like that. However, the teachers from San Benito attend our Hartnell summer session, our classes in Gilroy, Watsonville and Salinas and in the area where we have these centers. Now, if we can scrape up about an average of about 30 teachers for Hollister, we are delighted to send faculty members down, and if Mr. Cagney is unhappy about that, I would be glad to go into it with him.

MR. MARSHALL: Are these classes that you offer under Extension for credit?

DR. WILEY: Yes, sir, full college credit applicable to all degree requirements, and I might say to the Committee that at our two Extension centers we give the teachers up to 48 units of credit toward a degree or a credential, Bachelors Degree, of which 24 units represent residence credit. You

see, it is not straight Extension, but residence credit, and this was done at the request of Miss Stone, the County Superintendent of Schools, about two years ago because she felt that the teachers were having a difficulty in getting to the campus. So, we do all that we can possibly do.

DR. WEST: My understanding is that when the Hartnell Branch Summer Session started it was primarily for provisional teachers who possibly were housewives, too, and could not get away for six weeks to go to San Jose or some place else. So we brought the session here. Now, Dr. Wiley, who is also in charge of that, tells me the provisional teacher isn't in the greater number there any more, but there is a little more of a balance between provisional and those who want full credit.

DR. WILEY: The City of Salinas is hiring more teachers who have their degrees, you see, than they used to, so now our provisional teachers come from around Salinas and the rural areas.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Mr. Anderson, do you have a question?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Do these figures on your Extension program in the fall of 1958, do they reflect the Hartnell summer program?

DR. WILEY: No, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: That would be in addition?

DR. WILEY: In our last enrollment at Hartnell Summer Session there were 225 individuals.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Has this been carried on for a period of years?

DR. WILEY: Yes, sir.

DR. WEST: About five or six years.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: Your Extension program this year is less than half what it was a year ago, class-wise?

DR. WILEY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: And your registration is down even more than that. How do you account for that?

DR. WILEY: I don't know. I think--

DR. WEST: You don't have a full year.

DR. WILEY: We may be a little below this year than we were last year. I don't think that the enrollment can be projected indefinitely into the future on an upward curve. It hits plateaus and then moves up again, but I imagine we will take care of about 1100 or 1200 people this year.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: It will run that much this year?

DR. WILEY: Yes, sir. We have lots of flexibility in our program and we will try to offer--the only problem, Gentlemen, is that these Extension courses cause these people $8.50 a unit, and $17.00 for two units and $25.50 for a three-unit course. And there are some who just don't have the money to do it. Now, if the state were to provide us with financial support, and this is the old story you hear all the time--we can do whatever we are asked to do if you give us the money and

provide the finances. That is our job.

DR. WEST: Isn't it true that in the spring registrations you usually have a little higher than the fall on Extension?

DR. WILEY: Yes, sir.

DR. WEST: That will bring that up some.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: I was wondering about this money thing. $25.00 is what you pay for a three-unit course--

DR. WILEY: $25.50.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: And you have 30 students in some classes?

DR. WILEY: Some, yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Then in some classes you collect more money than you pay the instructor?

DR. WILEY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Now, does this give you money--does this money--where does this money go? Does this money go into permitting you to have classes below the level?

DR. WILEY: That is exactly right. If you will look at the registrations for some of these courses, Mr. Hegland, you will see that we have some classes with fairly low registrations. Here is one for 12 in Monterey in journalism, upper division, and so on. So we try to--

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: So this is really run as a non-profit deal?

DR. WILEY: Yes, non-profit--no profit at all, no,

sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: You could give us the profit.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Does Mr. Burton have the answer to my question?

DR. BURTON: Yes, sir, I have two sets of figures here which the Committee may be interested in. The first set are sources of new students at the college last year, 1957, Santa Clara County supplied the greatest number, 1,117; followed by Alameda, 332; San Mateo, 312; Los Angeles--

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: You are going too fast for me. After Santa Clara, who was the 332?

DR. BURTON: 332 for Alameda; San Mateo, 312; Los Angeles, 264; Contra Costa, 121; San Francisco, 84; Monterey, 82; and Santa Cruz, 81.

The other set of figures I have pertain to new entering freshmen for the same year from college enrollment area, 8; Monterey, 29; San Benito, 7; San Mateo, 214; Santa Clara, 809; and Santa Cruz, 50. I think these figures show that many of the students come to San Jose State College because of our specialized programs and they come from many counties throughout the state.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: I just make this observation to the Committee, that if you will compare, looking at this situation as an over-all education basin, you see that the real

numbers for service within the adjacent areas, both of which are vying for a state college, that this tells a very significant story.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no further questions, I want to thank you gentlemen for being here and testifying.

DR. WEST: Thank you very much.

MISS STONE: May I ask Dr. Wiley a question? I would like to bring it out to this Committee.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Yes.

MISS STONE: Don't we have trouble trying to get this Extension course, in getting your professors from San Jose State to come down? I think this is one of the great problems that we have wrestled with a good many years and we have to use our local people in most of the cases. I think this should be brought out.

DR. WILEY: The distance from San Jose to Monterey City is 150 miles, round trip, and many of our faculty members feel it is a pretty exhausting round trip, and the salary, the Extension salary is not too lucrative to begin with, and we find that 75 miles is a pretty smart piece, as they say, for a faculty member to travel, because he usually gets back very late at night, so we try to use qualified local people for our Extension classes and we are somewhat limited there, but you can see from the figures that we don't do too badly in offering courses. We certainly do send our own faculty members to

Salinas to the Hartnell Extension Center because that is 120 miles round trip, and the addition of 30 miles is the breaking point.

MISS STONE: We have to use our own staff members for Extension courses in southern Monterey County. They are not as capable, but I think sometimes the transfusion is good.

DR. WILEY: Yes, I think if we could arrange it so a faculty member could go down and we could afford to pay him to stay over night, you know the way they do, and that sort of thing, pay for his meals and guarantee him a reasonable salary, I think he wouldn't mind making the 125 or 250-mile trip to Kings City if the proper arrangements could be made.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: I had a question on that, Mr. Chairman. Do your faculty people volunteer for this, or are they at your call, or how do you organize it?

DR. WILEY: Strictly voluntary. When an Extension course is proposed by the county schools office or a local district superintendent and it seems that there is going to be enough support, why, I ask the head of the department if he can find a volunteer and this we do.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: I would like to ask Dr. West a question, if I might. Doctor, what is your student cost at San Jose State? Do you know offhand?

DR. WEST: Offhand, I don't. Is it in one of your reports you have--I think the round figure you mentioned of 700.00 or $800.00 is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: You can give it to me afterward.

DR. WEST: It is in one of these state reports, I think.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: You can report that to Mr. Britschgi.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: I think it is $800.00.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: While they are looking for that, we are going on here with our program, and I want to call on Monsignor Ryan who is representing the parochial schools here in this area.

MONSIGNOR RYAN: Well, I will just present some statistics if that is what you want.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Fine.

MONSIGNOR RYAN: We have six Catholic high schools in these three counties, Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz, and the total enrollment today at the present date: Palma High School, Salinas, has an enrollment of 530; Mora Central High School at Watsonville has an enrollment of 100. The St. Francis High School at Watsonville has an enrollment of 115. The Holy Cross High School at Santa Cruz has an enrollment of 156. The Santa Catalina School for Girls, the high school department here in Monterey, has an enrollment of 155; and the Junipero Memorial High School in Monterey has an enrollment of 284, for a total of 1,330.

Now, the ratio of the freshman class to the senior class

in these schools shows a 50 to 60 percent increase in the freshman classes and the number of graduates who attend a junior college would be approximately 45 percent. The number of graduates who attend college including those in junior colleges would be roughly 50 percent, and I can speak with more authority for Junipero High School here in Monterey because I am connected with that, and of the 44 graduates that we had last year, 27 are in college.

I have a couple of other comments to make here. Would the Catholic high school students of this area attend a four-year college? Very definitely, I think. Certainly very many of them would.

Would they attend a campus of the University of California? Certainly. Of course, not all of our graduates would be qualified, but those who are qualified, I am sure that many of them would be interested.

And another figure that may be of interest, the present grammar school enrollment in our schools in these three counties is 3,375 students.

ASSEMBLYMAN BEE: I was interested in one statement you made about Watsonville supporting two Catholic High schools.

MONSIGNOR RYAN: Yes. One is the Diocesan high school, the other is a high school that is run by the Salesian Fathers.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Father, what is the ratio of your

graduates who go on to college? Do you have any?

MONSIGNOR RYAN: Approximately 50 percent. As I said, I can speak with more authority about our own high school here in Monterey, Junipero Memorial--we had 44 graduates last June and 27 of them are in college.

MR. MARSHALL: What is the present pattern as to where they have gone? Is it local?

MONSIGNOR RYAN: Well, I think Dr. Huber has the figures for Monterey Peninsula College and I think 37 percent of our graduates from last spring are in Monterey Peninsula College, so approximately half of them would be there and the other half--well, there are a number up at U.C. after a summer at Santa Clara, there are some at Santa Clara and some of the girls are at Dominican up at San Rafael.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If there are no other questions, I want to thank you for appearing here today at our hearing.

MONSIGNOR RYAN: Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Our next witness here is Dr. Browne from the State Department of Education.

DR. BROWNE: I am Arthur D. Browne. Chairman Sedgwick, and Members of the Committee, I am from the State Department of Education specializing in higher education. I am particularly happy to be at this hearing and listen to all of the valuable evidence which has been presented here. I have come primarily to observe. However, I will be happy to cooperate

in every way I can with the Committee and to answer your questions to the best of my limited abilities. Mr. Sedgwick, I agree with the statement you made this morning. I thought it was very significant, that we are all headed down the same road. Your Committee, the State Department of Education, and the University of California, I think we all have the same objectives.

We would like to see the extension of collegiate education and facilities to as many qualified youths of the state as it is within our means and resources to provide. I think we are all concerned about the elimination of duplication of programs and this ties with another objective and that is to be concerned with the taxpayer and how to see that his investments go as far as possible. So I am very happy to cooperate with you and hope that we can have an orderly development of higher education and serve the needs wherever they arise.

There are three pending actions I think that bear upon the state college in this vicinity and all three have been mentioned here many times today. The first one is the House Resolution 202 which we are meeting under. And this as you may know is due to be submitted to the Legislature on the 10th day of the 1959 Session, and it will be turned over then, I am sure, by that date. It has yet to be passed by the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents.

It will possibly be modified or changed in some way by those boards.

The second pending action that at this time is the uncertainty of the location of the University of California campus. As Dr. Corley indicated this morning, they have been looking at sites, but they have not made a selection, and I think that this has an important bearing upon the question.

And the third one is the recent bond issue which was passed by Santa Cruz in which a junior college will be established in that area, and I think that will have an important bearing upon our problem here. Now, I believe that with these three, and there are many other conditions, of course, we are left in somewhat of a stage of uncertainty at the moment.

I would like to reinforce what Mr. Corley said earlier this morning. The liaison committee met last week, and as Mr. Corley indicated, they are very much concerned about coordination, and I believe that we will be achieving considerable action and thought by this group upon our problems, but before I left my office I thought that perhaps I should gather up some statistics to bring down here, and I pulled some together on Friday.

The latest stand of the Board of Education as far as I know is contained in the works which you already have, the additional center study and the letter from Dr. Simpson to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

I have a few additional statistics here which I gathered up informally in my office and I was very much interested in comparing those with some that have been given here this

morning. I was very much interested in Miss Stone's statistics and others which have been presented and I have gathered those and hope to have a chance to look at them more carefully. For example, I have here the population changes in the three counties under consideration. In April 1, 1950, for example, in the three counties, there were 211,402 persons in the census at that time. And now an estimate as of July 1, 1958, shows 278,800 persons, or a change of about 67,500 people, 31.9 percent change.

This varies all the way from, during the same period of time, 47 percent change of population or growth of population in Monterey County compared to 7 percent growth in Santa Cruz and nearly an 8 percent growth in San Benito.

These figures are from the California population in 1958 which was put out by the Department of Finance in Sacramento.

The number of high school graduates in Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties in 1950-51, and 1956-57 indicates during this period of time nearly a 21 percent increase.

In Monterey County in the public high school graduates we have a growth of 853 in 1950-51 to 1,030 in 1956-57; a growth in Santa Cruz from 492 public high school graduates in 1950-51 to 678 in 1956-57, or a growth of about nearly 38 percent during this period of time. In San Benito the growth was from 109 in 1950-51 to 139 in 1956-57 for a growth of 27-and-a-half percent.

The total for the three counties shows a growth from 1,454 in 1950-51 to 1,847 in 1956-57, a growth of 27 percent.

I have here an estimate made recently by the Department

of Finance on the future number of public high school graduates for the three counties. The estimate goes to 3,600 public high school graduates in 1969-70. I think you are familiar with the additional center study which was the last thing, I know, on the eligibility, that is the latest report on the eligibility of graduates and their continuation pattern as far as the joint staff has ascertained these.

And in the eligibility study it indicates that about 56 percent of the Monterey students were eligible for admission to the state colleges, 36 percent of the Santa Cruz students, and nearly 28 percent of the San Benito students. I think I can say that we are all concerned about the need of expansion in higher education.

The latest priority list of which I know about has been passed by our board is in the letter from Dr. Simpson to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee. I believe any objective observer looking at this situation would be able to say that you have--there are a lot of elements in this area for consideration of a state college. There are enrollment projections. I believe the additional center gives 3,800 as a 1969-70 enrollment projection for a state college in this area.

So there are favorable enrollments, there is rapid growth indicated by these data here on population and public high school graduates. The area is distant from an existing state college, although we are attempting, as the Dean from San Jose testified today, we are attempting to provide all the services possible

here by Extension programs, and this area does have fine junior colleges, and I believe it has been the policy of the Department that junior colleges be established in the area prior to consideration of state colleges. As I say, I would be happy to cooperate to the best of my ability to answer your questions.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much. Mr. Crawford, do you have a question?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: You spoke of a report which the liaison committee has prepared, that it has not been processed. Are you familiar with this report in its present state?

DR. BROWN: I am not sure I know which report you are referring to. The liaison committee had a session just this last week and considered several reports. As Mr. Corley indicated this morning, they discussed considerably the need for coordination of higher education and will attempt to do something about that problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: I am speaking of the report which the committee was requested to render to the Legislature.

DR. BROWNE: House Resolution 202, is that the one?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Yes.

DR. BROWNE: Yes, the liaison committee did discuss that report.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: And is the problem of the location of a state college in this area covered?

DR. BROWNE: Well, now, we come down to another

problem. The report is not complete yet because it hasn't gone to either the State Board of Education or to the Regents of the University of California, the two governing committees of this.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: I'm not interested in that. You are familiar with this report, are you not, in its present status, and you can answer this either "yes" or "no", or that you don't care to answer, but is the problem of the location of a state college in this area covered?

DR. BROWNE: May I say this--

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Yes or not, or you don't care to answer.

DR. BROWNE: I don't care to answer, but I would be happy to--

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: That is what we usually expect from the State Board of Education. What is the recommendation of the State Board of Education regarding the location of a state college in this area?

DR. BROWNE: The last recommendation I know is the one contained in the letter from Dr. Simpson to the Ways and Means Committee and the Assembly.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: What is the recommendation?

DR. BROWNE: Are you familiar with that?

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: You can tell me whether you are familiar with it or not.

DR. BROWNE: Yes, according to that report a priority listing was submitted to the Legislature, and on the

priority listing as I recall it, the Monterey-Sant Cruz area was listed as number 5.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: And is that still the recommendation today?

DR. BROWNE: Yes, this has not been revised as of the moment.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: With the liaison committee moving into the Orange County situation, what is going to happen to the state college program down there?

DR. BROWNE: May I ask--as far as I know, the Legislature has appropriated money for site acquisition. The site acquisition process is now going on. The target date for opening a state college there is next year, September of 1959.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: This new approach to coordination will not change this picture at all, then?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Absolutely not.

DR. BROWNE: I don't know of any changes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: No changes.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: In reference to this desire for coordination, were there any official representatives of the junior college people of California on any level sitting in with or participating in the discussions or voting on the discussions of the liaison committee?

DR. BROWNE: At the last session of the liaison

committee, I did not see any there.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Next question--then, the question has to do with the impact of these three factors which affect higher education in this county and one of them was the fact that Santa Cruz had voted a bond for a junior college.

MR. LIEN: The district was formed, but they did not vote the bond.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: The question is the same. You said there would be an impact. Could you tell us just what this would be, the impact on the decision of this decision of the voters--what will be the impact on the decision as to what finally happens because the voters have approved the district?

DR. BROWNE: Well, I would say the primary impact would be to allow the State Board of Education to be a little more favorably disposed toward a state college here because of local attempts to establish junior colleges first as shown by this action.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: In other words, you would say this would enhance the possibilities of a state college?

DR. BROWNE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: In this area?

DR. BROWNE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: And now while this has been the policy, announced policy of the State Board of Education, has this factor been considered in any actual situation in the formation or the authorization of any state colleges, and if so,

what state college? In other words, we have 13 of them. Now, when we formed each one of these 13, was there any instance in which the decision was made partly, to your knowledge, on the basis of a junior college in the area?

DR. BROWNE: Well, let me say this, almost all of the 13 were formed, most of the 13 were formed prior to, I think, the adoption of this policy. I am not certain as to the exact date of adoption of the policy. That is why I hesitate, but as I recall, it either came from the re-study of need for higher education in California or the additional center study. Each one of these studies was examined by the State Board, or that is a large part of the studies, and this was one of the policies which was adopted.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Now, in either one of these two cases, factually and accurately, was there any discussion of the obligation of the local communities for junior college districts before the formation and authorization of these on the liaison committee?

DR. BROWNE: I am sorry, I can't answer that because honestly, I don't know. I have only been in this position for a few months.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEGLAND: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like in complete friendliness and without throwing any barba to request that information be provided you as Chairman as to whether or not the liaison committee did, as indicated by its minutes, take any account of the formation or the local

willingness to support junior college districts in either one of those two instances.

DR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I refer this to my department and have them send a letter to you on that information. We would be happy to supply the information.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: If you will take that responsibility, we will appreciate it very much.

DR. BROWNE: I was not here then and I don't know what the liaison committee did.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: First of all, is it not true that the Department of Education and the Board of Education of the State of California has the prime responsibility for overall state policy in both the operation of junior colleges and state colleges to a varying degree, but primarily on a state level?

DR. BROWNE: To some degree, yes. I think more policy is exerted toward the state colleges probably than junior colleges because the local districts, of course, have policy boards for the junior colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: To clear your skirts, I will put it this way. Assuming, but not admitting that there is considerable overlap between the operation of both junior colleges and state colleges in vocational offerings, is this the responsibility--to what degree is this the responsibility of the Department of Public Education and the Board of Education

on the state level?

DR. BROWNE: The responsibility for vocational education--

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: If there is an overlap, if we in the State of California are paying for an overlap in any one of the districts where we find service by both the state college and the junior colleges of vocational studies, to what degree is this the responsibility of those two bodies on the state level? Do they have some? Do they have none, or just what is it?

DR. BROWNE: First of all, I don't know the degree of overlap between them.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Whose responsibility is it to find out if there is any degree of overlap?

DR. BROWNE: I think the liaison committee is the primary organization to attempt to eliminate or find out or ascertain duplication of collegiate service in public higher education.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Is it true the liaison committee at the present time does not have any representatives from junior colleges?

DR. BROWNE: At the present time?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: At the present time.

DR. BROWNE: I am sorry, I don't have a list of the members of the liaison committee here, but again I will be happy to send that to you.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Could you answer that, Dr. Corley?

MR. CORLEY: There are no junior college representatives.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: You just said what I knew.

MR. CORLEY: At the moment, but last Wednesday they decided junior college people should be represented.

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: A most admirable decision.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, I wish to thank you, Dr. Browne, for your testimony.

DR. BROWNE: Thank you very much, and I will try to get that information that you want.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I am going to call on Alice Wilder, member of the Santa Cruz County Board of Education. Mrs. Wilder.

MRS. WILDER: Mr. Chairman, I think my presentation is going to be completely unorthodox and probably heretical because it was my understanding until I came here today that the junior college program of the state was primarily an expense of the local taxpayers for the purpose of providing a terminal education to those young people who are unable to afford or unable to assimilate being exposed to more than two years of higher education and that the secondary position of a junior college was to provide the very necessary first two years of a four-year college, be it state or university, which was necessary in the local community because there were no four-

year or university facilities available and the young people would be at a tremendous hardship to have to pay for four years' education in a dormitory or boarding home aside from their area.

So today, I find that the emphasis on junior college apparently is to parallel the University of California's first two years or a state college first two years. I am surprised. It was not my theory and that shows how uneducated I am.

Now, as to the need of a four-year college in this area, I feel it is a very definite need. The facts and figures have been given to you by very able educators this morning and I won't attempt to duplicate them. I couldn't if I wanted to.

So I think that there are some things that we are not giving sufficient importance to and that is the projection figures have been predicated very largely on the birth rates and the children in school at the present time, and the tremendous impact of these enthusiasts that are coming into our state from outside and their birth rate is not considered sufficiently and considering what is going to happen to our educational system in these counties because this Bay Area has an excellent climate, is an attractive place, and we are going to get an ever-increasing proportion of these outsiders that want to be insiders.

And we are going to have to increase our projection figures, and I don't think that that has been sufficiently stressed to you people this morning.

In the discussion of the Extension classes of the

University of California much was said about the Extension classes which provided the teacher education or professional growth hours which is certainly a function that they are very ably taking care of in their Extension courses, but there is more than that to the Extension Service and the credits that are being given. I know in both this county and Santa Cruz County we have set up courses here in the counties for our welfare workers to provide them with sufficient credits which are-- probably this next session you people are going to insist they have it, and we are being a little beforehand in attempting to raise the standard of our welfare workers.

Now, they will get college credits for the work that they are doing on the Extension courses and I think that function of the University perhaps wasn't mentioned this morning in the emphasis on the very necessary work for teacher credit and accreditation.

Now, in the adult education there has been very little said on the four-year college or the Extension work of just the ordinary people like the rest of us who would like to go to college and take some extra work, and where you have a four-year college, it does open up a vista of opportunity which you don't have at the present time in either one of these areas.

It is too far to go to San Jose State and that is our nearest area, and having lived in the Oakland-Berkeley area most of my life and gone to the University of California for extra-curricula activity, I like many another miss that opportunity in this area, and I think that it would be appreciated and

greatly used.

The discussion has been on two-year colleges giving the equivalent in education facilities and opportunity to the students. I don't agree with that because I think on top of what a student gets at college there is the socialogical aspect which no one has dwelt upon today, of the give and take between a freshman and a senior student. You can't get that in the very best regulated of junior colleges because you don't have the age spread that your four-year college gets. I think that age spread is a very necessary part of the educating of any younger person. They are going to find in my opinion that their life after college has been made slightly easier when they have the competition in sports, in extra-curricular activities that a full four-year course gives. Now, again, your junior college, as the President of the Monterey Peninsula College has said, are keyed to what their local community wants and evidently here in the Carmel area they want largely university-type education, but again, it was my not my understanding of the function of the junior college when the taxpayers were asked to provide it at local district expense in the area of Santa Cruz County where I believe our children are too far distant to even get a commuting bus for a junior college. Our people are faced with a definite hardship which we will overcome with the formation of this new junior college district, but which have been for a period of years unable to educate unless we had the finances to board our children outside of the county and that is a

distinct hardship, and I don't think you can put a stopgap on education just because the State of California doesn't have money.

I think you people are smart enough to take a bigger take from the race track or something of that kind so that we aren't penalizing our youngsters because any lack of education isn't just a lack of education for the moment, it is a permanent handicapping of our students for life and I don't believe our children in our area of Santa Cruz County or in the Monterey Bay Area should be penalized in their opportunity to compete in industry and outside with those more favorably located where they can use a four-year college. And that is actually what is happening to our youngsters.

There was something said today about, or I understood it to be said, that there might be a trend not to have on-campus training for anyone who wanted to get a degree. Now, I don't know exactly what was meant by that, but from my point of view I think an on-campus training is an essential part of a college education. It is--you might just as well take a mail-order course from some one of the well-known correspondence schools. You learn in your head, but you don't experience unless you have gone where you have a give and take with your betters and your superiors and that can only be attained if you are a part of a campus life and I would hate to see the day when you presented or made it possible for somebody to sit at home and take a correspondence course and then call them equal to a college

graduate who has experienced the full meaning of college life.

I was asked to speak today for Sister James Matilda of Holy Cross--the Father has spoken for all the Catholic schools of the area and she said that in her class this year there will be 41 seniors. Of that 41 seniors, 25 will be prepared to enter a four-year college. Of that 25, 15 would go to a four-year college if there was a four-year college within reasonable distance. That means the Monterey Bay Area. 10 will go to junior college because there are junior colleges in the Monterey Bay Area. Of those 15, she tells me that half of them will attend a junior college because the families cannot afford to send them outside of the area and entail the expense of college outside of their own home environment, and I think that is all I have to comment on.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you very much, Mrs. Wilder. Are there any questions anyone has? If not, we appreciate your testimony very much. Now, I am going to call on Mr. Hubbard, Director of Lockheed Missile Plant, Santa Cruz. Mr. Hubbard.

MR. HUBBARD: I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I am an engineering manager, very interested in education, but not a professional educator. I think there are two aspects of the industry that I represent that may be interesting to the Committee. First, the educational load that the people supported by this industry represent in the community, and secondly, the educational requirements that such a company

has for employees.

I think that many aspects of the missile business today, although they appear now to be exclusively tied to military uses, actually forerunners of civilian use, are for computers, electronic gear and so forth, and I think it is important to recognize this as the new direction that industry is going, and I think that here in the Monterey Bay Area and Santa Cruz County there is little doubt but what industry is going to come in, and I think that by and large some of the aspects of Lockheed's operation will be typical of the new type of industry that may come in.

At the present time we have roughly 300 employees at the Santa Cruz Bay Lockheed, and the total in the Bay Area is on the order of 15000 employees. The 300 employees that we have out here are broken into very typical distribution between between the skills. In general, they are highly skilled, approximately one-third of the 300 are professional and scientific personnel having Bachelors Degrees, Masters Degrees, and long experience in a particular specialty.

About a third are highly skilled and trained technicians who have a certain amount of formal education, but by and large do not have degrees, but rather have specific vocational training or experience.

Now, about a sixth of the remaining people are degree people but without a technical training, business degrees and so forth, that account for supervisors and administrators.

Another sixth are clerical and unskilled laboring type of people.

Now, I think it is highly significant that such a large portion of the work force are highly educated and skilled. I was very interested a moment ago--someone was identifying the areas of interest of the junior college, the state college and then the University, and this paralleled to a considerable extent the breakdown that I have just given. Approximately one-third of our employees requiring vocational type training can secure it at the junior college, about a third are university-type people, and the remaining, about a sixth of our present distribution are state-college type people. The fact that such industry as Lockheed requires highly educated, of course, indicates a higher educational load in itself, and I think here is another point that is extremely important.

At present there is a terrific shortage of educators and the state college, I think, would largely help alleviate that problem. It is particularly true that educators are short in the areas that Lockheed right now requires help in obtaining educated people for. Dr. Huber spoke of the advisory committee from the community for the Monterey Peninsula College. I happen to be a member of the committee of electronics and we have been considering the educational load produced by the community and lately have looked into the supply of personnel for operating the courses, and I know first-hand that there is a tremendous shortage.

I think that is all the remarks I had. May I answer any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: What part of the responsibility has Lockheed assumed in helping some of these youngsters get the education that you in your firm desire?

MR. HUBBARD: They have done three things in three areas. First we helped finance additional courses for individuals who have demonstrated their scholastic ability by getting a degree. Secondly, we have been active in the community. We have cooperated, in fact, we initiated and then cooperated in setting up an electronics course in San Lorenzo Valley operated by Monterey Peninsula College. We encourage our employees to take such courses and make certain that account is made in their advancement of their taking courses.

We, through a scholarship program, encourage higher education for the children of our employees and I would say that approximately half of the some 400 children that are being raised by Lockheed Santa Cruz personnel will probably go on to higher education, which is an unusually high percentage.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: I knew you were taking a part in it and I wanted to ask that loaded question to get it into the record because I think we are going to have to impose upon industry, that they are going to have to help carry a little bit of this tremendous load that has fallen on the people in the State of California, and I think Lockheed should certainly be complimented for it.

MR. HUBBARD: I think we are well aware of that fact and are taking all of those immediate steps available to us to help.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRITSCHGI: That is all.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? Thank you for your testimony. Now, is Stuart Mitchell in the audience?

DR. HUBER: Mr. Chairman, he had an appointment at 3:30 and it was necessary for him to leave.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Dr. Gary Brown, San Benito County High School, Hollister. Mr. Brown.

DR. BROWN: We have a small junior college at Hollister, too. We are experiencing the same general pattern that these other schools are going through. Our growth is perhaps a little slower, but our high school is growing fairly fast. Today we are about 800 and we expect over 1200 by 1965. We sort of rejuvenated our junior college. While we only have 112 in it now, we had less than 30 in it two years ago so a lot more interest has developed and it shows indication of growing fairly fast.

We are pretty well located in that we have people now coming from Gilroy and Los Banos and some of the adjacent areas as well.

You talked a good deal about overlapping between junior college and state college and universities. Yet the fact has not been brought out that perhaps it might be cheaper from the taxpayer's standpoint if the state helped subsidize a little more the

the junior colleges rather than putting up new state colleges.

In other words, in our junior college, as small as it is, we are giving adequate lower division work so that a youngster can parallel the work at San Jose State or even at California, for that matter, and we have people that are going on and doing perfectly well in upper division.

Even if the state college were located over here, we would still have the same problem that it isn't within easy commuting distance from Hollister to Monterey. It is about 40 miles, so I doubt if too many of our people would be able to attend a four-year college.

We sort of wondery why perhaps in this case and perhaps some other cases it is necessary that a state college give the first two years of undergraduate work. If you will remember when Long Beach State College was set up, the theory was that it was only going to give upper division work, but then there were, as I recall, nine junior colleges that were to feed into it. Somehow that didn't work out, but it would seem to me it would bear a little consideration that the junior colleges do more of this lower division work.

It certainly is cheaper from the taxpayer's standpoing, though again it becomes rather unfair. In our district we are educating most of our youngsters that want to go onto college for the first two years and our district pays the whole cost less the $125.00 a year we get from the state. On the other hand, if the youngster is able or fortunate enough to live

within commuting distance of a state college, he can go on and supposedly the cost to the taxpayer would be quite a bit less. We are doing the same sort of work. I think there is an awful lot of needless duplication, but on the other hand, I don't think it is fair that our local taxpayers should have to foot quite so much of the bill. Unless we are on State Aid, we get nothing on building facilities and $125.00 per ADA unit and that certainly isn't very much towards meeting our total costs. Even though we educate around 400 or 500, that $125.00 doesn't go too far, so I wish and perhaps the Committee--there has been a lot of talk around this point, but there hasn't been anything definitely focused on it.

I can remember perhaps as long ago as 20 years when California kept talking that some day it would be just an upper division and a graduate institution. They would eventually cut out the lower division and the junior colleges would take over that function and it would help solve a lot of their problems as far as crowding went. Certainly, the cost would be a lot cheaper, and while we are not bragging, even in a place as small as ours, I think the quality of education in the basic courses and also science, for example, at California, is certainly just as good, if not better, than at the University of California.

I realize that some of my former professors up there might disagree, but when I took chemistry 1A and 1B at California I think there were 1500 of us in the lecture room and we

have 12 in our chemistry 1A and 1B and those youngsters are getting a chance to learn a lot more from first-hand contact with the instructor than they get in a place like California. I am quite concerned about this emphasis on quantity rather than quality in education.

I think a lot of people are going on to college perhaps that might do better if they were doing something else, and I also think that this idea of giving everybody that they want without earning it is getting to be a rather serious problem in our whole social philosophy.

If a youngster has earned the right to go by outstanding grades or if he wants to work part of the time, fine, but just to keep building more and more institutions to try to give everybody in our population a college education, as a taxpayer, not an educator, you begin to wonder where it is all going to end and I would hope this Committee could give a little consideration to that type of thing.

As far as we are concerned, we would be very happy to see an advanced institution somewhere in this area, either California or a state college.

I suspect our preference would be a little more along the university lines than a state college. Actually, they are both doing about the same thing anyway and I think perhaps for an upper division and a graduate type of instruction we might get a little better qualified teachers out of the University, with no reflection on the state college, but they talk about

expanding their schools of education and it looks to me like it is about a toss-up as far as who is going to give what.

I have had a hard time from this discussion today in understanding why we need both a state college and a branch of the University in this area as of today or even in the next 10 years. I think that is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, unless I can answer some questions about San Benito County.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any questions from any of the members?

ASSEMBLYMAN HANNA: Just making a remark aimed at your observation on the cost and the possibility of the state giving more to the junior colleges to help them carry the load, would you comment on the probable results of our tying the state college budget to a full-time equivalent student ration as a means of establishing their budget? Would it have the probable effect of encouraging them to overlap or to spread out in their operations? Do you think we run into something there where we perhaps would encourage this by tying their budget to the number of students that they can show are warm bodies occupying seats?

DR. BROWN: I suppose so. The trend seems to be that the bigger you are and the more students you can get, the better institution you have, which I certainly don't agree with for a minute. I would sooner see a lot smaller junior colleges with individual instruction, closer to individual instruction, than these large groups that are coming into the state colleges.

San Jose State is so swamped now and that goes, I guess,

now for most of the state colleges, too. Some of them will be the first to admit that they aren't so happy being so crowded as they are. I don't know specifically the answer to your question whether that would encourage more people or not.

Surprisingly, most schools seem to be crowded and yet there is quite a little competition for students even so, but I wouldn't know how to answer that question definitely.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, thank you very much, Dr. Brown. We will now have Ed Hill, representing Dr. Magee, Superintendent of Santa Cruz Schools.

MR. HILL: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Edward Hill, Director of Auxiliary Services for Santa Cruz City Schools. The report that I have given you today I think is a duplication of a summarized report which was given to you by Mr. Gordon Sinclair, and therefore it was prepared for your use by our City Schools and I will ask your forgiveness if there is some duplication because Mr. Sinclair has gone over these facts and we have re-hashed them for quite anumber of hours today. I feel that the Committee may use the facts as they so desire and that I won't elaborate on the information here which is the survey of the graduation class of 1958 for the Santa Cruz High School. It does indicate that around 50 percent of our youngsters go off to college and are in college now and that this survey is not significantly different than the surveys in past years.

We note here now that probably at the end of this year

there will be somewhat like 359 graduates in our schools and projecting what we know about these school populations, we may assume that this will increase about 5 percent a year, and by 1965 we will have 750 students.

Now, I don't put too much stock in this kind of figuring. I would like to explain why. Santa Cruz County is located adjacent to Santa Clara County. Santa Clara County has grown much beyond any predictions made for this county. You have heard from Mr. Hubbard of the Lockheed Missile Group that is in Santa Cruz County and Sylvania is locating in Santa Cruz County, and Santa Cruz is located adjacent to an area which very shortly is going to spill over.

Santa Cruz right now is relatively isolated from the Bay Area. It is not a convenient experience to live in Santa Cruz County and have to commute over to the production areas of the Santa Clara County.

Right now a commuter will spend from 60 to 90 minutes to reach the Lockheed area of employment, where right now there are some 15,000 employed in various fields.

However, at the present time they are cracking the teapot by furnishing a freeway system into that area. I have a report from a fellow that just rode over the freeway from Oakland in one hour and 15 minutes from Aptos, a shorter time to Oakland than we now spend getting over into the Sunnyvale area.

The new freeway system will put all of Santa Cruz County within a commuting distance of the vast industrial complex of

the Santa Clara Valley and I would challenge the Committee that as the result of this, all of the predictions of the Committee and all of the surveys done so far will be somewhat invalid, and the reason for this is that you just can't project. You just don't know how many people and how fast a community can grow and Santa Cruz County is a small county, 70,000 or thereabouts in population, nestled right up against an industrial population of somewhat less than one million and if somewhat like 7 percent decided to settle in a nice fertile area such as the Santa Cruz area and have their homes overlook the ocean instead of overlooking the smog, we might see a vast difference in the nature of population of Santa Cruz County.

Now, in the timetable of this, under contract now is the highway construction which will bring Bascom Avenue in San Jose within approximately 21 minutes of most of the Santa Cruz area.

We have the Superintendent of the San Lorenzo Valley Schools that will show his school system has grown 19 percent last year alone. The San Lorenzo Valley is the one that is closest to this teacup breaking, and I would just present this to this Committee at this time for consideration.

We have a teacup there and it is going to break open and it is going to provide more people in the Santa Cruz area. We have not grown like the Monterey or Salinas areas because of the isolation of Santa Cruz. You can't get in there for big industries. You can't provide the kind of services for big industry like the Santa Clara Valley can and other valleys that

aren't so tied in, but with the completion of this freeway complex we may not bring in the big industries, but certainly we are going to bring in light industries and certainly we are going to bring in the people. The population is going to be over there and I think that this Committee doesn't have to look far to see what happened to San Fernando when adequate transportation was furnished in the San Fernando Valley.

Well, I present this for your consideration and I didn't present the information that Dr. Magee told me to besause this information had been presented earlier.

I thank you very much for your attention and time and if there are any questions I will be very glad to answer them.

ASSEMBLYMAN CUSANOVICH: 780 thousand of them?

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: About five times as many of your graduates attend Monterey Peninsula College as Hartnell. Is there any particular reason for that?

MR. HILL: I am not prepared to make the answer. I have heard that it is a little more convenient to ride the Monterey Peninsula College bus and it is a matter of selection. It doesn't take much more time. The youngsters have to get up before daylight and they get home after dark and it is just a matter of choice among these youngsters to come into Monterey Peninsula instead of Hartnell. I think the transportation--if I am notmistaken there is one more bus.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: One more bus.

MR. HILL: I know they run two bus schedules into--

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON: You mentioned smog. Where is this smog you are talking about?

MR. HILL: The San Francisco Bay Area has a smog control area, and I shouldn't mention this, but when we come in from the pure, clear air of Santa Cruz, we note that there is just a slight difference when you go over the hill.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Howard Wire, Superintendent of San Lorenzo Unified Schools from Felton.

MR. WIRE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The hour is growing late and you have been statisticked to death. I will try to make this as brief as possible. Ed Hill mentioned the fact that we have grown in our San Lorenzo District, which is located just north of Santa Cruz District, and comprises Felton and Boulder Creek area. We grew this year 19.3 percent and in the past two years our school enrollment has grown 46 percent. This growth, while we cannot project enrollments on the basis of present growth, it seems to me that it is a significant thing in view of the fact that we are so located near Santa Cruz County. We are going to grow and we are going to grow rapidly and I think we are going to grow rapidly for a number of years.

One other bit of statistics I brought to you is the increase in enrollment in college preparatory students. In 1955, 28 percent of our graduates went on to college. In 1956, 33-and-one-third percent went on. In 1957, 34 percent went on and last year, 51 percent.

There are many obvious reasons and I am sure you are well aware of them. We have the impact at Lockheed as Mr. Hubbard has mentioned. Each one of these parents of the Lockheed Missile Plant sees so clearly the need for education above the high school level and each one of them is preaching to their sons and daughters to get more education. By their own example, as Mr. Hubbard pointed out, they themselves are going on to higher education classes.

Monterey Peninsula College established this course in basic electronics in our school district this year primarily for the Lockheed people, for the adults of the community, and they feel this very keenly. This is only the first of a number of courses that is planned at the adult level and they are planned not for use of leisure time, but because in this day and age they feel the need for these advanced courses.

We are all keenly aware of the impact of automaton on higher education, where a few years ago, in fact I would say now, the assembly line may be the thing, but in the next 5 or 10 years and it is happening now, the assembly line will be comprised of someone sitting before a bank of television cameras and operating buttons, and it will be the technicians that keep all that machinery going, rather than someone with a wrench tightening up a nut.

I think we are all aware of this.

One other point that I would like to mention, we observe in our school, in our own school system--I can't call this a

trend in all school districts, but I think it is significant. This year we have had a decided drop in enrollment in elective subjects such as homemaking, shop, chorus and this type of subject which in the past has been known as a snap course and it now goes begging. We started out with full-time enrollment in homemaking last spring. We came back to school in the fall with an entirely inadequate size class and in this next year, we will have to take homemaking or the beginning homemaking classes entirely out of our curriculum. I don't think this is just an accident. People are saying, well, we have to go on to college. We are feeling this very strongly in our district.

I want to bring up just one point about this matter of colleges and location of colleges. It seems to me it is important for this Committee to consider the size. I am going to talk about San Jose College because it is close to us. The size of the present state college--it would appear to me that San Jose College has grown to the point where the acquisition of additional land would be or must necessarily be at fantastic and uneconomical prices.

Because of the growth of these present state colleges, it seems to me that we just have to move them to the population centers in the local community. At some point you just have to break up these larger institutions.

The same thing obviously applies to the University of California. So that we are talking today not necessarily about whether or not we are going to have higher education, but where

it is going to be located. The present size of the state college itself is going to dictate much of this. It seems to me that it will be just far more economical to place a college in another area where we do, and certainly we do in the Santa Cruz and Monterey area have the population to support it. I think that is all I would have there.

Are there any questions? I would be glad to answer them.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: You spoke in your opening statement of a growth of 19 percent. Could you tell me what the numerical figures were?

MR. WIRE: Some 200. I should have made that clear. We are a relatively small district of about 1200 so this represents a growth of a little over 200.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: Thank you.

MR. WIRE: We had around a thousand last year.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Any other questions? If not, I want to thank you for your time.

MR. WIRE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Before we bring this hearing to a conclusion, is there anyone else in the audience that would like to testify? Would you come forward and state your name?

MRS. LEFFINGWELL: As one of the Committee men asked, if some of these larger companies weren't doing something about the type of higher education--I know that Allis Chalmers and Westinghouse and General Electric pay boys to go to school.

They take some of the boys in their junior year. I know our son studied a year in Milwaukee with Allis Chalmers and they paid him $475.00 a month to go to school and a friend of his went to Schenectady, New York, and he is being $500.00 a month. This is his second year.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: That is better than being an Assemblyman.

MRS. LEFFINGWELL: But the big companies are doing something about this education.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: I think they have those programs of education in different portions of the state in California. I think they have been very helpful in seeing that some of their outstanding employees have been able to get a higher education. Is there anyone else? Would you please come forward, this lady back here?

MRS. BLISS: I would like to state one thing that was of great interest to me today and that was to see the change from the role of the junior college in California trend, and I believe it was interesting to note that the Committee felt that higher education comes at three levels. Therefore, may I ask you if there any possibility that junior colleges could be removed from a secondary code and be put in where they belong?

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: That is a good question. I think that involves money again and that is one of our big problems. Thank you very much for your observation.

MR. ARELOE: I am a farmer and taxpayer and a very

interested person in this Committee's actions. I would like to remind you that a number of years ago the State Legislature saw fit to put an institution at Soledad that is used for collegiate individuals. I am referring to the state prison there. If you see fit to do something of that nature, I think you should also, this Committee, should see fit to put an institution of higher education in this area that would perhaps counteract that influence in our community.

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CRAWFORD: That isn't strictly a local institution.

MR. LIEN: I just wanted to add this little thought, that in addition to the parochial schools, we do have some private schools here who are not represented here today. I am referring to our Monterey Bay Academy and a couple of private schools here on the Peninsula, and for your own calculation, if you wanted to use a percentage of increase over the public school impact, I would in my estimates--it goes about 12 percent higher because of the presence of these schools

CHAIRMAN SEDGWICK: Is there anyone else here now who wishes to make a statement? If not, are there any observations by the Committee members? I will make the observation first of all that I want to express my appreciation to you people here in Monterey for the fine reception we have had here, and I particularly want to thank Mr. Conelly here from Santa Cruz who has so ably assisted us in preparing the people

that have given the very informative testimonies. These testimonies that we have heard here today will be reviewed by this Committee before we write our report to the State Legislature in the next few weeks, and we feel sure that in due time this area will have an institution of higher education. It is a question in my mind right at the moment whether they are going to have the University of California or a state college. I for one don't think they are going to have both for many years, but from my observation it seems to me that the people of this community probably favor the University. I could be wrong. But anyway I feel sure that you will receive one or the other institution in the not-too-far distance. With those remarks, again I wish to thank you for extending us the courtesies that you have here in Monterey. Thank you very much.

(Thereupon the hearing was adjourned.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

---oOo---

This is to certify that I, Alice Book, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, was present at the time and place the foregoing proceedings were heard before the Assembly Interim Committee on Education Subcommittee on Higher Education Beyond the 12th Grade, California State Legislature, at the Mark Thomas Inn, Monterey, California, Monday, December 15, 1958, and that as such reporter I did take down said proceedings in shorthand writing, and that thereafter I caused the shorthand writing to be transcribed into longhand typewriting, and that the foregoing pages beginning at the top of page 1 to and including line 14 on page 136 hereof, consistute a true, complete, accurate and correct transcription of the aforementioned shorthand writing.

Dated this 29th day of December, 1958.

ALICE BOOK

---oOo---

ALICE BOOK
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
2844 VERNA WAY, SACRAMENTO 21, CALIFORNIA

Certain defects were observed in this volume when it was received by University Microfilms, Inc. Since we were unable to locate a perfect copy, this volume was filmed as received.

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.